

THE CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

Edited by John T. Saywell

VOLUME XLI, NO. 3

SEPTEMBER, 1960

Joseph Howe: Opportunist or Empire-builder?	
J. M. BECK	185
Quebec, 1763-1774: The Financial Administration	
H. R. BALLS	203
The Wintering Partners and the Hudson's Bay Company, 1867-1879	
DUANE C. TWAY	215
Reviews (<i>see following page</i>)	224
Graduate Theses in Canadian History and Related Subjects	260
Recent Publications Relating to Canada	269
Books Received	273
Notes and Comments (<i>see following page</i>)	275

PUBLISHED BY UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS

REVIEWS

THORNTON, <i>The Imperial Idea and Its Enemies: A Study in British Power</i> ; BENIANS, BUTLER, and CARRINGTON, eds., <i>The Cambridge History of the British Empire</i> . III. <i>The Empire-Commonwealth</i> : by John Conway	234
WOLFE: <i>Portraiture and Genealogy</i> ; CONNELL, <i>The Plains of Abraham</i> ; HIBBERT, <i>Wolfe at Quebec</i> ; LLOYD, <i>The Capture of Quebec</i> ; REILLY, <i>The Rest to Fortune: The Life of Major-General James Wolfe</i> ; STACEY, <i>Quebec, 1759: The Seige and the Battle</i> : by Richard A. Preston	231
LOUGH, <i>An Introduction to Eighteenth Century France</i> : by Crane Brinton	235
SHOTWELL, <i>The Long Way To Freedom</i> : by Richard M. Saunders	237
HOLBORN, <i>A History of Modern Germany: The Reformation</i> : by Franklin L. Ford	237
ROPP, <i>War in the Modern World</i> : by C. C. Bayley	238
EDEN, <i>The Memoirs of the Rt. Hon. Sir Anthony Eden: Full Circle</i> : by A. P. Thornton	239
BUCHAN, <i>The Spare Chancellor: The Life of Walter Bagehot</i> : by David Spring	241
CELOVSKY, <i>Das Münchener Abkommen von 1938</i> : by R. A. Spencer	241
CLARK, <i>Movements of Political Protest in Canada, 1640-1840</i> : by W. L. Morton	243
HOPKINS and HARGREAVES, eds., <i>The Papers of Henry Clay. I. The Rising Statesman, 1797-1814</i> : by Thomas J. Pressly	245
LABAREE, BELL, BOATMAN, and FINEMAN, eds., <i>The Papers of Benjamin Franklin. I. January 6, 1706 through December 31, 1734</i> : by Bernard Bailyn	247
SISSONS, <i>Church and State in Canadian Education: An Historical Study</i> : by Franklin A. Walker	248
MCDUGALL, ed., <i>Our Living Tradition, Second and Third Series</i> : by H. Blair Neatby	249
AITKEN, DEUTSCH, et al., <i>The American Economic Impact on Canada</i> : by Morris Zaslow	250
CLARK, <i>Frontier America: The Story of the Westward Movement</i> ; CURTI and associates, <i>The Making of an American Community: A Case Study of Democracy in a Frontier Country</i> by Wallace D. Farnham	252
REMINI, <i>Martin Van Buren and the Making of the Democratic Party</i> : by D. M. L. Farr	254
BEAVERBROOK, <i>Friends: Sixty Years of Intimate Personal Relations with Richard Bedford Bennett</i> : by L. G. Thomas	255
STACEY, ed., <i>Records of the Nile Voyageurs, 1884-1885: The Canadian Voyageur Contingent in the Gordon Relief Expedition</i> : by Guy MacLean	255
NOTED	256

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Historians in Canada; Irish Studies; Dictionary of Canadian Biography; Contributors	275
---	-----

THE CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW Continuing

The Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada

Founded at the University of Toronto in 1896

Articles in the REVIEW are indexed in the *Canadian Index* and in the *International Index to Periodical Literature*.

Communications with regard to subscriptions and advertising should be addressed to The Director, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Canada. Individual subscriptions \$4.00 a year.

AUTHORIZED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER BY THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, OTTAWA

Joseph Howe: Opportunist or Empire-builder?

J. M. BECK

THE BIOGRAPHER faces a difficult task when he seeks to disentangle a politician's motives from his professed principles. In few, if any, cases can he use the methods of the psycho-analyst to assist him. Yet he ought not to dismiss summarily his subject's political ideals, simply because they might be predicated upon a desire for personal gain or advancement. It is this writer's opinion that Professor James A. Roy makes such an error in his volume entitled *Joseph Howe: A Study in Achievement and Frustration*,¹ especially when he deals with Howe's quest for imperial office after 1855.

Undoubtedly Professor Roy has grounds for becoming annoyed with Howe. In reciting his own accomplishments Howe was, on occasion, anything but modest; in the earlier stages of the quest the tone of his letters was, at times, irritatingly ingratiating; over an extended period he kept urging his claims with unashamed persistence upon any British minister who would listen. But although some of this may leave a bad taste, it is at least comprehensible, and perhaps even forgivable, when not divorced from the context in which it occurred. To present the complete picture, we must fit Howe's claims into a consistent concept of empire, which Professor Roy glosses over and minimizes. The result is that Professor Donald Creighton, perhaps following Roy, is led to the altogether one-sided conclusion that "poverty drove [Howe] into an unseemly hunt for jobs."²

Howe's claims for recognition were, to say the least, compelling. That he had passed his "whole life . . . in the study of Colonial questions—in close observation of the working of British American, and Colonial

¹James A. Roy, *Joseph Howe: A Study in Achievement and Frustration* (Toronto, 1935).

²D. G. Creighton, *Dominion of the North*. New edition. (Toronto, 1957), 250.

Institutions"³ is hardly a perversion of the truth. That he should stress his services as "the exponent and advocate of the new system of Administration that pervades British America, and which we call Responsible Government"⁴ was entirely logical. Perhaps it was somewhat ungracious of him to assert that "mainly by my exertions, the Constitution of my Native Province was remodelled and established upon sound principles."⁵ Surely he was only a member of the team of Huntington, Uniacke, Doyle, and associates who worked towards that end. Yet in this team Howe was at least *inter stellas luna minores* rather than *primus inter pares*. For it was he who presented the practical case for responsible government to the authorities in London as no other Nova Scotian could have done it; it was he who by his extended tours to every hamlet throughout the province familiarized his fellow Nova Scotians with the principles which the team was espousing; and it was certainly he who swung the balance in the closely contested, crucial election of 1847 and thereby made the inauguration of responsible government possible.

Howe's assertion that he had "conducted the successful administrations of Sir John Harvey and Sir Gaspard Le Marchant"⁶ between 1848 and 1854 may also come as a surprise. For throughout this period the recognized leader of the government—the title of premier had not yet come into use—was James B. Uniacke. But Uniacke's position carried with it little more prestige than that of any other executive councillor, and meant simply that Le was the formal medium of communication between the Executive Council and the Lieutenant-Governor. Furthermore, the chief business of the provincial government was conducted in the office of the Provincial Secretary headed by Howe, and in the eyes of Nova Scotians generally it was his administration, not that of the colourless Uniacke. Even in his relations with Governors Harvey and Le Marchant, Howe was far closer to them than any other executive councillor, Uniacke included.

Howe's reference to "a system of Public Works, devised by me, and now rapidly advancing"⁷ is likewise not exaggerated. For it was he who almost single-handedly persuaded the Provincial Legislature to initiate the building of railways as public enterprises; it was he who after many setbacks arranged with British capitalists and the British government for the financing of the first Nova Scotian railways; and

³Public Archives of Canada, Howe Papers, VII, Howe to Russell (confidential), March 15, 1855.

⁴*Ibid.*, Howe to Molesworth, Sept. 10, 1855.

⁵*Ibid.*, Howe to Blackwood, Nov. 15, 1856.

⁶*Ibid.*, Howe to Russell, Aug. 10, 1859.

⁷*Ibid.*, Howe to Blackwood, Nov. 15, 1856.

it was he who as first chairman of the Railway Board superintended both the planning of these works and their detailed execution.

Under these circumstances Howe could legitimately tell the Colonial Secretary that at fifty years of age he had "exhausted the range of ambition" within Nova Scotia. To the ordinary run of man this would not have been serious; to the restless, inquiring spirit that was Howe it was something akin to catastrophe. For what appears to be a major deficiency in every biography of Howe to date is the failure to appreciate how much he was actuated by an irresistible drive to see, to know, and to participate. Wherever he went he took with him an almost insatiable curiosity to observe every form of human endeavour at first hand. Once having seen and learned, he was eager to offer his views to the responsible officials, even though the matter was no concern of his. Not until a serious breakdown took its toll of his magnificent physique in 1869 did he curtail his extensive peregrinations, and, Professor Roy notwithstanding, his intellectual curiosity remained undiminished to the end of his days.

A second characteristic of Howe which is insufficiently stressed was his almost reverential attitude towards British institutions and the British heritage. Howe's loyalty for his native province may have approached fanaticism, but it in no wise exceeded his loyalty for the Mother Country. Howe, the son of a Loyalist, was himself the Loyalist *par excellence*. Going to England, was, in his eyes, going home. A Nova Scotian should look, not westward to the backwoods of Canada, but eastward to the heart of the Empire. In 1866 he wrote: "I am a dear lover of old England and to save her would blow Nova Scotia into the air or scuttle her like an old ship."⁸ But, as Dr. D. C. Harvey has pointed out, Howe had no difficulty in reconciling his local and imperial patriotisms. In his mind any lack of harmony between Britain and her Empire could be overcome simply "by removing all survivals of the old Colonial system, not as a step towards separation from the British stream of thought and tradition, but rather that [colonials might feel themselves] in the midst of that stream, bearing [their] tributary contribution to the heart of the empire with gratitude and self-respect."⁹

It is this concept which governed Howe when he replied¹⁰ to the proposals of J. W. Johnston for the union of the British North American colonies in the Nova Scotian House of Assembly in February, 1854.

⁸*Ibid.*, IX, Howe to Sir John C. D. Hay (private), Nov. 12, 1866.

⁹D. C. Harvey, *Joseph Howe and Local Patriotism*. An inaugural lecture published in pamphlet form (University of Manitoba, 1921), 13-14.

¹⁰See Howe's speech on "The Organization of the Empire" in J. A. Chisholm, *The Speeches and Letters of Joseph Howe* (Halifax, 1909), II, 268-95.

In place of union, Howe called for the solution of pressing problems within the Empire. In particular, he pleaded with British statesmen to combine the intellectual resources of the colonies with those of the Mother Country for the government and preservation of the Empire. To promote this end he suggested, first, the representation of colonials in the British House of Commons. Put one or two Nova Scotians in the Commons, he said, and one British company would not continue to monopolize all the mines and minerals of the province as it had for thirty years; no minister would dare to bring down a reciprocity treaty which bartered away the fisheries of Nova Scotia without its being consulted; no ministry would think of withdrawing its guarantees to Nova Scotia for railway construction, thereby sully the national faith.

Secondly, Howe requested that energetic spirits in the colonies be permitted to participate in the government of the Empire. In only one respect did he envy the Americans—the boundless field of emulation and rivalry in which the poorest man in the poorest state might win the highest national honours.

The sons of the rebels are men full-grown; the sons of the loyalists are not. . . . What national distinction ever lights upon British America? Has she ever supplied a governor to the Queen's widely extended dominions, a secretary, or an under-secretary of state? Have we ever had a man to represent us in either House of Parliament or in any imperial department? How long is this state of pupillage to last? Not long. If British statesmen do not take this matter in hand, we soon shall. I yield to no man in respect for the flag of my fathers, but I will live under no flag, with a brand of inferiority to the other British races stamped upon my brow.¹¹

Look at the organization of the Colonial Office! It governed forty colonies and had not a single colonial in it. The Colonial Secretary and the Under-Secretaries, despite their high attainments, had no personal knowledge of colonial public or social life, nor hold upon the affections of the people. Look at the Governors! Their selection was confined to the circle of two small islands, to old officers and broken-down members of Parliament, in every way inferior to leading spirits in the colonies. Talk of a union of the provinces! "What we require is union with the empire; an investiture with the rights and dignity of British citizenship . . . how powerful this empire might be made; how prosperous in peace, how invincible in war, if the statesmen of England would set about its organization and draw to a common centre the high intellect which it contains."¹²

Just over a year later (March, 1855), while Howe was in the United States recruiting Americans for the British forces in the Crimea, word

¹¹*Ibid.*, 290-1.

¹²*Ibid.*, 292, 295.

came that Lord John Russell had succeeded to the Colonial Office and that the under-secretaryships had not yet been filled. Howe immediately requested one of the appointments as evidence of "the announcement of a new policy by which the highest Civil employments of the Crown were to be thrown open to the Queen's Colonial subjects."¹³ Thus began, says Professor Roy, "one of the most humiliating and self-abasing dunnings of Downing Street on record."¹⁴ At best this judgment seems somewhat harsh. Fifteen letters to the English officialdom over a six-year period hardly constitute a highly concentrated campaign of self-aggrandizement. Assembled and read together, they might tend to create the impression described by Professor Roy; scattered among hundreds of letters they reveal Howe the suppliant in a somewhat different light. Certainly the quest for imperial office was anything but uppermost in his mind, since he was constantly addressing himself to a host of other problems with all his accustomed vigour. Later students have magnified the intensity of the quest out of all proportion. The simple truth is that long experience had convinced Howe that the Colonial Office moved only under persistent urging; moreover, it required special efforts to keep one's claims under active consideration when three ministries and six Colonial Secretaries held office over a five-year period.

Undoubtedly Howe made his request with all the less diffidence because Lord John Russell was Colonial Secretary. To him Howe had addressed letters on public questions as early as 1839 and their relations had long been characterized by the utmost frankness. On this occasion Russell could do little to assist him; he informed Howe that the vacancy at the Colonial Office had been filled, that he agreed on the advantage of "holding out to men of capacity & character [in the colonies] the promise of an honourable ambition in the Imperial service,"¹⁵ and that he hoped he might be of service to Howe in the future.

Three months later Howe renewed his request in London itself, while he negotiated a loan for the Nova Scotian railways. Prior to a personal interview with Russell, he forwarded his speech on "The Organization of the Empire," which had recently been published in pamphlet form. In the accompanying letter he stated: "A Colonial Governorship, if there was a vacancy, I would not refuse."¹⁶ But clearly his heart was set on a position at the centre of the Empire and preferably in Russell's own office. He hoped eventually to win his way

¹³Howe Papers, VII, Howe to Russell, March 15, 1855.

¹⁴Roy, *Howe*, 200.

¹⁵Howe Papers, II, Russell to Howe, April 10, 1855.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, VII, Howe to Russell, July 3, 1855.

into Parliament and distinguish himself by the intelligent dispatch of the business entrusted to his care. Getting into Parliament first and aspiring to office afterwards, he admitted, was the ordinary rule, but perhaps it might be "waived in favour of a person who had held all the principal offices in his Province and served the Queen in other capacities."

"To win a position here, in the heart of my fatherland," continued Howe, "is my highest ambition." Here is the key to an understanding of his quest for office. Legitimate ambition, not poverty, was the driving force behind it. As Chairman of the Railway Board, Howe received excellent remuneration and, as he himself realized, would never be much better off so long as his assistance to the unfortunate always exceeded his means. Accordingly he saw in imperial office not the hope of financial rewards, but the high mission of improving the government of the Empire. His contacts with British statesmen had led him to conclude that he was in no way their intellectual inferior. His long experience, he felt, could be put to use in devising colonial constitutions and in generally improving colonial organization. His talents as a public writer might be "turned to account in the controversies which perpetually arise" in government.¹⁷

As usual, the reply was gracious; his claims would definitely be considered whenever a suitable vacancy occurred.¹⁸ Actually he was fortunate to get a reply at all; certainly he could not have chosen a worse time to press his claims on Russell. Earlier in the year, at a conference in Vienna, Lord John had accepted a compromise for solving the problems of the Middle East and the Black Sea. Later, just as Howe was seeking office, Russell had condemned the same compromise in the strongest of terms. Immediately a storm of indignation broke over his head which can "only be explained by the neurotic emotions of a great war and by the terror lest the costly sacrifices of the struggle should issue in a dishonourable peace."¹⁹ Annoyed that Lord John had lacked a vigorous defendant in Parliament and in the press and grateful for his assurances with respect to employment, Howe dashed off a fair statement of Russell's case, hoping that the article might do some good if published in a paper which the government controlled.²⁰ The Colonial Secretary expressed his gratitude, but doubted "whether the noise of the present clamour [would] allow the voice of justice to be heard."²¹ On the day he wrote

¹⁷*Ibid.*

¹⁸Howe Papers, II, Arthur Russell to Howe, July 10, 1855.

¹⁹G. P. Gooch, ed., *The Later Correspondence of Lord John Russell, 1840-78* (London, 1925), II, 187.

²⁰Howe Papers, VII, Howe to Russell (confidential), July 11, 1855.

²¹*Ibid.*, II, Russell to Howe, July 13, 1855.

this letter he resigned; he remained out of office for almost four years. No worse blow could have befallen Howe's aspirations for office; the British statesman most cognizant of his services and ability had been removed from the political scene.

About this time Howe's pamphlet on "The Organization of the Empire" drew a reply from the Canadian Francis Hincks, who chanced to be overseas on business.²² In a nutshell, Hincks asserted that the existing colonial system was "all that can be reasonably desired" and that "the grievances stated by Mr. Howe have no existence." As for colonial representation in the Commons, it was utterly impractical. If the colonies desired to participate in the government of the Empire, they would have to share in the burden of defence and Hincks doubted their willingness to do so.

As to the limitations upon ambition in the colonies, Hincks felt that "the British provinces . . . present[ed] as fair a field for an ambitious man as they could do under any other circumstances." It was true that, if the provinces became states of the American Union, their public men might compete for a few higher prizes, but "all the local prizes would be deteriorated in value, and the probability of attaining any of the others would be small." Even in the existing circumstances, the still higher prizes of England were not beyond the reach of colonials. There was "nothing to prevent Mr. Howe himself from transferring his talents to the English arena, should he be of opinion that Nova Scotia afford[ed] too limited a field for their display."

Several times previously Hincks and Howe had disagreed on public policy. A particularly stormy controversy had developed between the two over an alleged breach of faith by Hincks in the intercolonial railway question. Howe could never get it out of his head that, after joining in negotiations with Maritime leaders for such a railway, Hincks had sacrificed the interests of the Maritimes by abandoning the project in favour of one put forward by his capitalist friends associated with the Grand Trunk. The Grand Trunk scheme later brought about the downfall of Hincks's ministry; after he and some of his colleagues were accused of using the promotion for their personal gain, the so-called Colbert of Canada was forced to resign in September, 1854. Howe's pamphlet on the organization of the Empire with its reference to a vast scheme of jobbery and corruption in Canada by which the vital interests of British America had been overthrown, had apparently stung Hincks to the quick.

Yet it is strange that in making a personal defence he, a former radical, supported the colonial status quo in every particular. As Howe reminded him in his reply (August, 1855): "You used to have a keen

²²Francis Hincks, *Reminiscences of His Public Life* (Montreal, 1884), 228-50.

eye for a grievance, but I fear prosperity has clouded your vision. You used to strain at a gnat, and now you can scarcely see a camel." Howe doubted if Hincks's arguments on distinctions were worthy of serious note unless he could show (which he failed to do) that a colonist's career did not practically stop when he became a provincial minister.

I contend that it does; that, having reached that point, he is hedged in by barriers which he cannot overleap; that, thenceforward, he must "fling away ambition"; that he has got into a *cul-de-sac*; that he finds John Bull, looking very like a beadle, guarding the rich scenery beyond and saying to him, as he marks the expression of his long eye, "No thoroughfare here."²³

On the broader question of imperial-colonial relations, Howe denied that the colonies were unwilling to share the cost of defending the Empire. If colonial minds were permitted to assist in adjusting the relations of the colonies with Britain and foreign countries, and if "a fair distribution of the honours and distinctions of the empire made it a point of honour and of duty," almost all the provinces would send a regiment to assist the Mother Country against her enemies. With this assistance British statesmen would be able to feel independent of treacherous allies and the British people more certain of the safety of their soil, their institutions, and their high civilization.

To realize this great conception there is nothing wanting but to draw into the Councils of this Empire the ripened intellects and noble spirits that lead this population. Talk not to me of difficulties. All government is compromise, and half the diplomacy wasted on "the four points" [at Vienna] would soon adjust details.

The Hincks-Howe debate had an interesting sequel. After allowing Russell's successor, Sir William Molesworth, some time to settle down, Howe resumed his quest for office on September 4.²⁴ By this time he had come to perceive that the possibilities of appointment to the Colonial Office were limited and the barriers in the way formidable. A governorship, he hinted, would be about as acceptable as an under-secretaryship. Three days later Molesworth informed him that he had just had "the satisfaction of establishing a precedent for seeking occupants for Imperial posts among distinguished men of the colonies."²⁵ The Queen had approved his nomination of Francis Hincks as Governor in Chief of Barbadoes and the Windward Islands. He hoped to meet Howe's wishes as well if an opportunity arose, but he saw no immediate prospect of a suitable vacancy, either at home or abroad.

²³For the complete reply, see Chisholm, *Speeches*, II, 311-27.

²⁴Howe Papers, VII, Howe to Molesworth, Sept. 4, 1855.

²⁵*Ibid.*, II, Molesworth to Howe, Sept. 7, 1855.

All unknown to Howe, Molesworth had first broached the matter to Hincks on August 17,²⁶ and the latter had declined a position with the Grand Trunk to accept the governorship. The *London Times* hailed the appointment as "the inauguration of a totally different system of policy from that which has been hitherto pursued with regard to our colonies."²⁷ The *Montreal Pilot* called it "the most practical comment which can possibly be offered upon the solemn and sorrowful complaints of Mr. Howe, anent the neglect with which Colonists are treated by the Imperial Government. . . . Perhaps his turn may not be far distant."²⁸

As for Howe, the injustice and irony of it all could not have escaped him. When the principle which he had laboured to establish was at last accepted, it was for the benefit of a politician who was under a cloud for allegedly using his public position to further his private interests;²⁹ he himself, despite his not inferior abilities and irreproachable public conduct, remained unrecognized. Nevertheless, he expressed satisfaction to Molesworth for his early recognition of the new principle, even in the case of a man with whom he had often differed. If Hincks's selection were followed up by that of other colonials as suitable vacancies occurred, a new spirit would be infused into the colonies. If it were not, it could be regarded only as an indication of the strength of the English combinations which Hincks served and which others of independent opinions declined to conciliate.³⁰

Shortly afterwards Howe departed for Nova Scotia. Professor Roy's picture is that of a man "sorely troubled in spirit" and oppressed by a "sickening sense of failure."³¹ Since the relevant documents do not support these statements, one can only conclude that Roy is indulging in a type of imaginative licence which is expected of the creator of fiction, but not of the serious biographer. Disappointed Howe may have been, but no one had a more amazing faculty than he for dismissing the unpleasantness of the past and for turning hopefully to the future. Furthermore, his official mission had been concluded satisfactorily, and for his success he was shortly to receive special recognition from the Nova Scotia Legislature. Perhaps no opinion other than the foregoing could be expected from a biographer who had decided that after 1855 Howe's career was an unrelieved record of disappointment and failure, and who arranged all the pieces to create that effect.

²⁶Hincks, *Reminiscences*, 363.

²⁷*Ibid.*, 364.

²⁸*Ibid.*, 366-7.

²⁹See R. S. Longley, *Sir Francis Hincks* (Toronto, 1943), 234-41.

³⁰Howe Papers, VII, Howe to Molesworth, Sept. 10, 1855.

³¹Roy, *Howe*, 202.

A year later (October, 1856) Howe resumed his quest for office. This time he asked an old acquaintance at the Colonial Office, Arthur Blackwood, to submit his claims to Henry Labouchere, Molesworth's successor as Colonial Secretary.³² Once more came the assurance that his request was being recorded, and a reminder that there were many claimants on the patronage of the Crown.³³ In his letter of thanks³⁴ Howe again stated that, because of the insuperable obstacles in the way of an under-secretaryship, he would be content with a governorship, but for the first time he also expressed his determination not to serve further under a lieutenant-governor. "I have earned and held all the offices sometimes with no slight exercise of patience. If I cannot rise I will not descend, but, resuming my own profession and retaining an independent seat in the Legislature, will be content with the influence I can command and the ranks which British America, fairly estimating my services, may accord." Useless words! Howe was drawn to political life no less than iron filings to a magnet. For a political animal such as he, resolutions like the foregoing were therefore quite meaningless. If promotion to a more extended sphere were denied, Howe would still be at the very centre of Nova Scotian politics.

So ended part one of the quest. For the next twenty months, eventful ones for Howe, imperial office was largely forgotten. During that time came his break with the Irish Catholics and eventually with the entire Catholic body of Nova Scotia. This led, in turn, to the defeat of the Liberal government in March, 1857, and the resignation of Howe from the Railway Board. It led also to his campaign to unite the Protestants in opposition to the Conservatives and their Catholic allies at the next election. But by mid-1858 the picture had altered and Howe was restless. His duties as an assemblyman were over for the year; the Catholic question had largely subsided and required none of his energies; an election and an opportunity to defeat the Johnston administration were still a year away.

In these circumstances part two of the quest for office had its beginning. This time the avenues of approach were somewhat uninviting. To Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton, the Colonial Secretary under Lord Derby, Howe was a complete stranger. Accordingly the best course seemed to be the bold one—an approach to the man at the top. Perhaps Derby might recall his interviews with Howe during the railway negotiations of 1851 and 1852.

After the usual lengthy recital of his claims, Howe concentrated upon the governorship of British Oregon, his own name for the future

³²Molesworth had died in October, 1855.

³³Howe Papers, II, Blackwood to Howe, Oct. 22, 1856.

³⁴*Ibid.*, VII, Howe to Blackwood, Nov. 15, 1856.

colony of British Columbia.³⁵ If he were only given the opportunity, its resources would permit him to lay the foundations of a "Noble Colony."

Many British Subjects that now go from Home or from the Northern Provinces would follow me there. It would not be difficult to attract a great many within the United States territory to reside again under the old flag. Chinese would come in . . . and make useful settlers. . . . There is no reason why the spare labour of the world should drift into the United States, if it can be attracted to British possessions, and England should have within her own territory in Oregon a commercial emporium, from which lines of steam communication might soon radiate, and through which she might hereafter exercise a powerful influence in all that part of the world.

Howe had indeed caught a vision; he was prepared, moreover, to set about making it a reality at a moment's notice. But to all this enthusiasm not a word of reply came from the British Prime Minister.

The period from June to November Howe spent in the United States. Again his restless and inquiring mind drove him to "a careful examination of the condition of [the country], social, political, and industrial, from Maine to Texas."³⁶ By late November he had completed the primary object of his visit—the publication of his speeches and public letters. Between November 27 and 29 he forwarded the two large volumes to all who might assist him in securing imperial office. But this time the tone of the accompanying letters was different.³⁷ There was a note of irritation that he had been kept waiting so long for what he should have been granted as a right. Now, for the first time, it might be fairly alleged that financial need was a contributing factor in his drive for office; Howe was without steady employment and he had used up his resources in publishing his papers.

With some bitterness he complained to William Bridges of the Metro General Life Assurance about the promotion of "all sorts of simples and blockheads"³⁸ over his head. In the letters to Derby, Bulwer-Lytton, and the permanent Under-Secretary, Herman Merivale, the language was not quite so outspoken, but its purport was the same. Let them imagine his feelings "when men of no Colonial experience, who have done no service to British America, who have no knowledge of it, who have never written a line, made a speech or struck a blow for its improvement and who are intellectually to say the least of it

³⁵*Ibid.*, Howe to Derby, June 16, 1858. The colony of British Columbia was created and its government provided for by a British statute of August, 1858.

³⁶*Ibid.*, Howe to Sir Gaspard Le Marchant, Nov. 29, 1858.

³⁷W. L. Grant takes the view that from the start Howe declined to "abase himself before the well-meaning mediocrities like Labouchere or Newcastle. He could not do it. In none of his letters do we find the real tone of the office-seeker." *The Tribune of Nova Scotia* (Toronto, 1920), 128.

³⁸Howe Papers, VII, Howe to Bridges, Nov. 29, 1858.

not [his] superiors, are sent to rule our Provinces, whose resources, mental and industrial, [he has] illustrated and developed by the labours of half a life."³⁹

In this series of letters Howe was undoubtedly guilty of one indiscretion when he asked Russell to plead his case with a ministry to which Lord John was politically opposed. Russell went out of his way, none the less, to inform Howe that his two volumes were "mark'd with the talent & patriotism which distinguish you."⁴⁰ Naturally he said also that he could not possibly interfere in the patronage of the Derby ministry. But to label this, "an unmistakeable snub,"⁴¹ as Professor Roy does, is incomprehensible. Roy seems to delight in singling out instances of alleged snubs and cold formality. Possibly the Colonial Office may have decided to do nothing for Howe, but its replies were always courteous and generally friendly. Knowing Howe as they did, its officials would not act otherwise for fear of certain castigation at his hands.

Derby's reply, which Professor Roy describes as throwing out "a meagre crumb of comfort,"⁴² was regarded by Howe as "a very handsome letter." In it the Prime Minister expressed his appreciation of Howe's services in colonial government for the preceding twenty years, and the belief that neither the Colonial Office nor Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton would underrate those services.⁴³ In reply, Howe assured Derby that Bulwer-Lytton had manifested no desire to do him injustice; as a matter of fact, his claims had only recently been brought to the Colonial Secretary's notice. Consequently he was still hoping for the governorship of British Oregon.⁴⁴ But he was not building up false hopes, for about the same time he wrote to Sir Denis Le Marchant: "I suppose they will do something with or for me, but shall not break my heart, if they do not."⁴⁵ As it turned out, his letters to Derby and Le Marchant crossed another in the mails in which the Colonial Secretary expressed his regret that, because of the limited number of offices at his disposal, there appeared little probability that Howe's wishes could be met in the immediate future.⁴⁶

That concluded Howe's correspondence with the Derby administration. In June of 1859 Palmerston was back in office with Lord John

³⁹*Ibid.*, Howe to Merivale, Nov. 29, 1858. See also Howe to Derby, Nov. 29, 1858 and Howe to Bulwer-Lytton, Nov. 27, 1858.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, II, Russell to Howe, Jan. 8, 1859.

⁴¹Roy, *Howe*, 213.

⁴²*Ibid.*

⁴³Howe Papers, II, Derby to Howe (private), Jan. 17, 1859.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, VII, Howe to Derby, March 8, 1859.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, Howe to Sir Denis Le Marchant, March 10, 1859. Sir Denis was the brother of Governor Le Marchant.

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, II, Carnarvon (for Bulwer-Lytton) to Howe, Feb. 15, 1859.

Russell as his Foreign Secretary. Meanwhile Howe had been busy electioneering in Nova Scotia, and largely through his efforts the Liberals appeared to have won.⁴⁷ But in accordance with the conventions of that day the Johnston administration could not be displaced until the Legislature met early in 1860. So Howe was again at loose ends and looking towards London.

In August he approached Russell with a new claim and a new request.⁴⁸ During the Crimean War, he pointed out, he had raised troops for Britain in the United States at infinite peril to himself; afterwards, for two years, he had defended British policy, the British ambassador, and himself in "speeches, pamphlets, and newspaper articles, widely circulated on both sides of the Atlantic." An indirect result was the loss of his own office at a cost to himself of £2,000 to date. The Derby ministry could not have been expected to recognize this claim, since it had opposed the policy on which it was based. But with Palmerston and Russell the situation was different, for it was their policy which Howe had been carrying out in the United States.

The new request was for employment with the Foreign Office. Howe confessed that he had begun to despair of working for the Colonial Office, first, because he did not know its new head, the Duke of Newcastle, and secondly, because he had "spoken too plainly . . . to be much of a favourite there." He admitted that he was not as well fitted for Russell's department, but he at least knew the United States better than and the South American states as well as "many of those to whom the interests of the Empire are often entrusted in these countries."

This letter raises the question of whether the cards had been stacked against Howe from the beginning in his quest for office. According to Professor Roy, "the tragedy was that Howe was unable to realize that the reasons for his failure lay in himself."⁴⁹ He argues that for twenty years Howe, a mere colonial, had presumed to lecture and advise Her Majesty's ministers; that he had almost invariably been proven right; and that he was never forgiven for the brilliance of his talents. Another of Howe's biographers, W. L. Grant, had expressed the belief earlier that "the Colonial Office had no fancy for a turbulent, great-hearted, idealistic Howe, with views on Imperial consolidation, who avowedly wanted office as a means of influencing the British public and if possible of entrance into the Imperial parliament."⁵⁰ But this is certainly not the whole story. The British climate was uncon-

⁴⁷This was the "disputed" election of 1859, in which a number of Liberal members were alleged to be disqualified because of office-holding.

⁴⁸Howe Papers, VII, Howe to Russell, Aug. 10, 1859.

⁴⁹Roy, *Howe*, 199.

⁵⁰Grant, *Tribune*, 129.

genial to Howe for other reasons. This was the day of the "Little Englanders" in which the Empire was generally held in low esteem. It was also the day in which political instability was the normal condition, and ministry succeeded ministry at short intervals. Was it not to be expected under these circumstances that the limited patronage of the Crown would be used entirely to serve domestic ends, both political and personal?

Russell referred Howe's letter to Newcastle, who expressed a desire to employ him, but doubted if an opportunity would soon arise, since "a very large number of unemployed colonial Governors [were] eagerly applying for any [vacancy] that chance [might] bring."⁵¹ The reply outraged Howe, who proceeded to examine, "with reference to much higher interests than [his] own," the principles which ought to govern patronage like colonial governorships.⁵² The men currently being sent out as governors, he pointed out, were much like those who had lost the American colonies, because of their inability to comprehend and deal with the intellectual and material developments going on around them; on the other hand, the men now passed over in the colonies were like those who drove the governors out, made a nation, and became governors and generals, ambassadors and presidents, thus "exchanging the obscurity of Colonial life for the front ranks in history." Even the most loyal colonist would be less than human if he did not ultimately resent the promotion over his head of persons not to be compared to him in experience, ability, or administrative talent. "If the Colonial Empire is to be maintained," he concluded, "it must be organized and its energies called forth and directed by men of a different stamp from many of those who do not seem to know how to make a Colony anything but a source of weakness and expense."

Shortly afterwards (February, 1860) Howe became Provincial Secretary in the Young administration, and six months later leader of the government of Nova Scotia for the first time. When the Duke of Newcastle visited Halifax in company with the Prince of Wales in mid-summer, 1860, Howe did not intrude a personal matter, but later addressed the Colonial Secretary in Canada, again expressing a desire to "reproduce Nova Scotia . . . in some region [particularly Oregon] where the vital energy which free Institutions bring with them is most required."⁵³ A year later he repeated the request, this time for Newfoundland, "where some tact and common sense appear to be much wanted," or British Columbia, where he thought he might do the most

⁵¹ Howe Papers, II, Newcastle to Russell, Aug. 26, 1859.

⁵² *Ibid.*, VII, Howe to Newcastle, Dec. 15, 1859.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, Howe to Newcastle, Aug. 15, 1860.

good.⁵⁴ Thus, whether in office or out of it, impoverished or comparatively well off, Howe steadily pursued the quest for office.

Finally, in December, 1862, after further appeals to Russell and Newcastle, Howe was rewarded with a fishery commissionership under the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. While the duties of the office were somewhat slight, it did provide the rather handsome remuneration of £750 per annum, and ample time for travelling about and delving into all sorts of problems, an opportunity which Howe used to the full over the next three years. At the outset Howe considered the position to be merely the first step towards higher imperial office. But that was not to be. In the spring of 1866, with the Reciprocity Treaty about to be terminated, it was once more necessary for him to give thought to the future. A handsome offer to edit the New York *Albion* elated him no end. To Mrs. Howe he wrote:

we can live here [i.e., in New York] in our usual quiet way and put by \$1,000 to pay our debts every year, leaving our assets in Nova Scotia undiminished. For this new and unexpected mercy I fervently thank God. It makes me feel more independent of all chances and casualties than I have done for many a day.⁵⁵

Yet it would mean the abandonment of his hopes for higher office and of the promotion of his concept of empire. Consequently he directed a request to the Colonial Secretary for the continuation of his commissionership with new terms of reference. But in the end, without taking up the editorship or waiting for a final reply from England, he assumed the financially unremunerative task of saving his countrymen from a federation to which they had not given their assent. The irony of it all is that when he finally received a governorship—that of his native province—it came, not from the British government which he had long dunned, but from the Dominion whose creation he had strongly opposed.

Professor Roy considers that this relative lack of success in office-seeking constitutes an important part of Howe—a study in frustration. But he misses the one thing which might have caused Howe to feel frustrated during the sixties and seventies (although it did not)—his failure to win acceptance for the concept of empire which he had enunciated during the fifties. For the importance which he attached to this concept continued to be reflected in his later letters and speeches. He was particularly critical of "the Manchester school of politicians"

⁵⁴*Ibid.*, VIII, Howe to Newcastle, July 10, 1861. W. L. Grant calls it "a sad spectacle, that of the great man knocking at preferment's door, and knocking in vain." *Tribune*, 128. But, unlike Roy, he does not separate Howe's office-seeking from his concept of empire.

⁵⁵Public Archives of Nova Scotia, a volume of Howe letters collected by J. A. Chisholm, Howe to Mrs. Howe, Jan. 15, 1866, 186-7.

and their intimations that they would not be unhappy if the colonies chose to become independent. He also trained his sights on those who belaboured the colonies for not contributing more materially to their own defence. The tone of criticism in the House of Lords after the Parliament of Canada rejected the Militia Bill of 1862 especially irritated him. It was madness, he told Newcastle, to wound the susceptibilities of a loyal people by silly speeches and to set them thinking of separation, "but if we are driven to shape our future without any regard to England's honour and interest (which appears to be the advice given by some of these wise-acres) we can make a nation sooner than they think."⁵⁶ On this occasion he asked that he be sent to the various provinces to settle by negotiation, rather than by irritating speeches "flung to and fro across the sea," the whole question of provincial participation in defence, both in peace and war.

Later, in a speech at Niagara,⁵⁷ he expressed the same sentiments publicly. Separation, he kept reminding the public men of Britain, would be a sadder blow for England than for the colonies, because it would leave her without a harbour, a spar, or a ton of coal on the continent of America. In December of 1862 he replied⁵⁸ to the proposition of C. B. Adderley that, just as the thirteen original colonies had done, the five existing North American colonies should provide for their own defence. "A thorough scheme of organization," he contended, would be "more acceptable to proud and unrepresented communities than repeated requests for uncovenanted assistance. . . . Does it never occur to you that you ought to elevate us to the full dignity of citizenship, before you call upon us to assume all its burthens? That before you ask us to share with you all the perils and cost of empire, you should share with us its honours and distinctions?"⁵⁹

When, at Russell's request, Howe produced another paper on "The Organization of the Empire"⁶⁰ in October, 1866, he called it the "result of ten years of reflection on the grandest subject to which an Englishman can turn his thoughts."⁶¹ I am satisfied," he continued, "that we ought all to think in that direction and go for 'The Empire, one and indivisible' rather than for any scheme of dismemberment." The scheme of dismemberment to which Howe alluded was the proposed federation of British America. It is not too much to say that Howe opposed Confederation because he felt it to be incompatible with his concept of empire. The diverse and unconnected colonies, he contended, were

⁵⁶Howe Papers, VIII, Howe to Newcastle, April 17, 1862.

⁵⁷Chisholm, *Speeches*, II, 372-83.

⁵⁸Howe to Adderley, Dec. 24, 1862. Quoted in Roy, *Howe*, 242.

⁵⁹Chisholm, *Speeches*, II, 388.

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, 492-506.

⁶¹Howe Papers. IX. Howe to Stanley, Nov. 14, 1866.

not yet prepared for union; federation would not put them in a better position to defend themselves; the method of effecting it would lead in Nova Scotia to the all-pervading sentiment of loyalty being replaced by a mood of sullen indifference and the growth of annexationist sympathies. "We go in for the Empire one and indivisible but when the old ship is broken up we are not such fools as to trust our lives in a crazy craft in which we are certain to be drowned."⁶²

From this time on his disillusionment with British politicians developed apace. The indifference with which the British Parliament treated the Act of Confederation he considered to be an utter disgrace. "I believed . . . that the House of Lords would do justice though the heavens should fall; that a man with a manly, honest face could go to the bar of the House of Commons and obtain fair play . . . but if you ask me if I feel that confidence now, I am sorry to say that I do not."⁶³

Yet nothing could lead him to express disloyal sentiments. Undoubtedly he weakened his bargaining power in the movement for repeal by telling his opponents privately beforehand that, no matter what the outcome, he would pursue a thoroughly constitutional course. No one has yet assessed his considerable services in preventing the extremists from getting out of hand once the issue was decided. But after that there appears to have been an almost complete break in the correspondence which he had been carrying on with English statesmen for thirty years or more. And around him he thought he saw growing evidence of the dismemberment of the Empire. One sign was the substantial withdrawal of British troops from Canada. But the crowning blow was the sacrificing of Canadian interests by the Washington Treaty of 1871. Howe told the Governor General that the conduct of the British Commissioners was hasty, selfish, unfair, almost pusillanimous.⁶⁴ To Sir John Rose he wrote: "Bit by bit England gives North America away, and the feeling is becoming widespread here that the sooner we join that Branch of the English family that is not afraid of the other the better for us all."⁶⁵

At length (February 27, 1872) Howe ventured to express his opinions publicly in a speech at Ottawa.⁶⁶ The dismemberment of the Empire, he pointed out, had been openly forecast in leading British newspapers. While neither Crown, Parliament, nor people had de-

⁶²*Ibid.*, Howe to Hay, Nov. 12, 1866. He called it idiotic to "embark in this crazy Confederacy with a mongrel crew half French and half English and certain to be sent to the bottom at the first broadside."

⁶³Quoted from a speech given in Temperance Hall, Halifax, on Jan. 13, 1868. Chisholm, *Speeches*, II, 529.

⁶⁴Howe Papers, IX, Howe to the Governor General (private), Aug. 22, 1871.

⁶⁵*Ibid.*, XXXIX, Howe to Rose, June 26, 1871.

⁶⁶Chisholm, *Speeches*, II, 631-41.

liberately accepted this policy, the tendency of English thought and legislation seemed to indicate that the drift was under way. Because of the recent sacrifice of Canadian interests, he concluded, the time was rapidly approaching when Canadians and Englishmen must have "a clear and distinct understanding as to the hopes and obligations of the future." For this indiscretion Howe was suitably reprimanded in cabinet. Yet his remarks cannot be dismissed as the prattling of an ailing and weary old man. In them is reflected the natural disappointment of one whose high concept of empire is being spurned, but also the confidence that British America, if forced to fend for itself, can make its own way.

Howe paid the penalty of the solitary individual who urges ideas upon people not yet ready to receive them. The first great step forward in the government of the colonies had been the concession of responsible government in 1848. After that the "Little Englanders" were quite satisfied for the colonies to go their own way, expecting only that Britain would be credited with leading them on to full independence. While the government was content to retain the colonies provided they contributed to their own defence, it evinced no interest whatever in theoretical speculation regarding the future of the Empire. It was not until the mid-eighties that the idea of a centralized empire received substantial support in the movement for imperial federation, and it was not until the first decade of the twentieth century that it became clear that the final form of the Empire was to be the decentralization of the modern Commonwealth.

But for Howe, however impracticable his ideas may have been, the issue was clear in the fifties and sixties. Criticize him, if you will, for magnifying the difficulties of uniting the British North American colonies. Criticize him, too, for an exaggerated pro-British sentimentalism. But do not attribute his office-seeking primarily to selfish ambition or the hope of financial rewards. To him responsible government had conferred upon colonials only the partial rights of British citizens. As a natural extension, the Empire ought to be organized without delay to confer these rights in all their fullness. To serve this Empire was the noblest mission that he could conceive, preferably at its centre in London, but, alternatively, even in so remote and primitive a region as British Oregon.

Quebec, 1763-1774: The Financial Administration

H. R. BALLS

FROM THE EARLY DAYS of the British occupation of Quebec, the collection and disposition of the public revenue of the province was regarded by the imperial authorities in London as a prerogative of the Crown, and much of the history of public finance for the first seventy-five years of British administration is the story of London's continued effort to establish and retain a centralized control of the provincial finances. It is a story of the effect of the multiple representation of the Crown in the colony and of the control exercised by the Treasury, the Board of Trade and Plantations, and the other imperial departments and offices with interests in the colony over their local officers and of the embarrassments and frustrations caused thereby to the Governor and the Council by these conflicting and contradictory instructions. It is also a story of recurring skirmishes between the imperial authorities, the governors, the local officials, and the French and English inhabitants for the control of the provincial revenues. Throughout, it is marked by the recognition that control, to be fully effective, must include not only the right to determine what moneys are to be collected or disbursed, but also to ascertain that the moneys have been collected or spent as directed.

For many years prior to the conquest, a complex imperial organization had existed for the administration of the affairs of the American plantations and for the supervision of the colonial finances. During the period of the military occupation after the acquisition of Canada, the dues belonging to the Crown by right of conquest were collected by Brigadier General James Murray, the army commander, and the expenses of administering the territory were paid out of the funds for army extraordinaries. But following the signing of the Treaty of Paris on February 10, 1763, steps were taken to draw Canada further into the imperial framework. Murray was appointed Captain General and

Governor in Chief, and detailed instructions were prepared by the Board for Trade and Plantations and approved by the King in Council defining the constitution of the territory and outlining Murray's duties and responsibilities as Governor. Held to a strict accounting to the Commissioners for Trade and Plantations in all his proceedings and subject to directions from the Secretary of State for the Southern Department, the Governor's freedom of action was strictly controlled. In financial matters he was no less circumscribed. His commission¹ directed that all payments of public moneys should be made by warrants from the Governor with the advice and consent of the Council, and strict instructions were given for the recording and auditing of his financial transactions. He was instructed to keep "fair books of accounts" of all receipts and payments, and to have the accounts audited and attested by the Auditor General of the Plantations or his deputy. The Auditor was to send a statement of accounts to the Treasury every half year or oftener but the Governor was also directed to send another copy to the Commissioners for Trade and Plantations. The accounting directions were very specific: "in the books shall be specified every particular sum raised or disposed of, together with the names of the persons to whom any payment shall be made; to the end we may be satisfied of the right and due application of the revenue of our . . . province with the probability of the increase or diminution of it under each head and article thereof."²

British colonial policy before the conquest, and for many years thereafter, was designed to hold the colonies to a strict accountability, both financial and political. As a corollary, each colonial official receiving public moneys was held responsible for an ultimate accounting to the Exchequer for all moneys coming into his hands. The transmission of accounts to England was not merely for the purpose of a nominal or casual scrutiny. As early as 1703, instructions had been issued by Godolphin that all accounts of the King's revenues in the plantations should be prepared periodically for declaration before the Exchequer, and a similar accounting was required of all moneys issued out of the Exchequer.³ None of the colonial accounts, when audited, was submitted regularly to Parliament. They were scrutinized, not for Parliament, but for the Treasury as the protector of the King's revenues and treasure, and not the least of an accountant's responsibility lay in securing an acquittance from the Exchequer for the public moneys collected by or advanced to him for the King's service. This long and expensive pro-

¹Adam Shortt and Arthur G. Doughty, *Documents Relating to the Constitutional History of Canada 1759-1791* (Ottawa, 1918), I, 179.

²*Ibid.*, p. 187.

³C. M. Andrews, *Guide to the Materials for American History to 1783 in the Public Record Office of Great Britain* (Washington, 1912), II, 79.

cedure was an integral part of the machinery of financial control as it functioned during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was quite distinct from the local audit of the accounts and involved a progress through several redundant offices of the Exchequer of the accounts of every person who collected public revenues or who received advances from the Exchequer by imprest or otherwise, or from any collector or sub-accountant. Each step in the process, whether in the Audit Office, at the Treasury Board, before the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the offices of King's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancers, or in the Pipe Office weighed heavily on the time and financial resources of the accountant. Burdensome as it was, the payment of fees was as essential a part of the business of passing the accounts as any of the ancient processes of the Exchequer, and the officers were careful to see that no acquittance or "quietus" was issued until the fees were paid. Only when the progress through the Exchequer had been completed and the accounts declared before the Chancellor, when the balances due the public had been paid in, and when the fees due at the various offices had been met was the accountant able to procure from the Pipe Office the discharge "so essentially requisite to the tranquility of himself and his family."⁴

Civil government had been proclaimed in October, 1763,⁵ and in the following month Murray had been appointed Governor of the province, but it was not until August 10, 1764, that government under civil authority was actually established. For some time thereafter, no receiver general or collector of revenues was appointed by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, and Murray was obliged by the exigencies of the financial situation to make an appointment himself. He had been in communication with the Honourable and Reverend Robert Cholmondeley, the Surveyor and Auditor General of the King's revenues arising in America, who claimed the right of nominating the receiver general, suggesting his kinsman, Walter Murray as a suitable appointee.⁶ However, the question of Cholmondeley's right to audit the revenues of colonies acquired after the date of his patent was under discussion in London, and no immediate action was taken by the imperial authorities to fill the position. Consequently, "no one being named by proper authority," Murray, on September 14, 1764, appointed Walter Murray as Receiver General of "all revenues, rents, quit-rents, alienations, fines, amercements, due or hereafter to become due and payable to His Majesty, His Heirs and Successors . . . and of

⁴Public Archives of Canada, Quebec Privy Council Reports, D2, 362. All manuscript references are to documents in the Public Archives of Canada.

⁵Shortt and Doughty, *Documents*, I, 163-8.

⁶Murray Papers, II, 149-50.

all taxes and duties imposed or hereafter to be imposed by any authority whatsoever due and payable to His Majesty upon the sales of any prizes, reprisals, escheats, seizures and forfeitures or by any other ways or means whatsoever now due or belonging or hereafter to become due or belonging to His Majesty."⁷ The Receiver General's commission of appointment required him to post sufficient security and to act in accordance with such instructions as the Governor might issue, but no provision was made therein for the transmission or audit of his accounts and there is internal evidence suggesting that the Governor intended his commission to Walter Murray to be only an interim appointment.

Walter Murray appointed his son Richard as Deputy Receiver General and made arrangements to collect the customary revenues. In the *Quebec Gazette* of September 20, 1764, he published a notice calling on "all persons whatsoever, indebted to His Majesty's revenues in this province, either by quit rents, lods et ventes or other customary dues" to discharge or pay the same to himself or to his son on or before December 1. This notice brought little response and on October 10, a second notice appeared. The reaction to this must have been more favourable, for Walter Murray was able to account for £815.2.11 received by him for *lods et ventes* during his tenure of the receivership.⁸

The revenues of the province consisted of the duties on certain imports retained as customary under the French régime, the casual and territorial revenues, the fees on licences, and certain fines and forfeitures.⁹ The import duties, levied on wines, spirits, and dry goods, were collected by the Collector of Customs and were transmitted by him to the Receiver General. The casual revenues, consisting of the *quint* and the *lods et ventes*, were derived from taxes on the sale of property and were collected directly by the Receiver General. The territorial revenues consisted of the rent of the King's posts and the *cens et rentes*, which were the annual rents due to the seigneur for lands held from him or to the King for lands or houses held *en censive* from him in the city or suburbs of Quebec. These also were collected directly by the Receiver General. The fees, imposed originally by an ordinance published on November 3, 1764, and subsequently by an ordinance dated July 7, 1766, on licences for keeping public houses and for retailing spirituous liquors, were collected by the Provincial Secretary and were transmitted by him periodically to the Receiver General. The fines and forfeitures imposed by the courts were collected by the court officials for transmission to the Receiver General. In 1766,

⁷Original Correspondence, Board of Trade, 1763-1837, C.O. 42, II, part 1, 80.

⁸Colonial Correspondence—Canada (Quebec), Q4, 162-3.

⁹Shortt and Doughty, *Documents*, I, 54-60.

the Receiver General was instructed to control the property of and collect the revenues arising from the forfeited estates of religious orders, but conclusive evidence that any moneys were collected from these sources has not been found.

These revenues were not sufficient to meet expenses and the Governor was obliged to obtain funds to supplement the local collections. During the war, and throughout the period of military occupation, the financial requirements of the military commander had been met by drawing on the Military Chest, or by issuing bills of exchange on the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, the Paymaster General, or the exchange contractors which were sold to local merchants for transmission to London for payment. The exigencies of war had tended to much extravagance but it was apparent that the demands for economy which followed the advent of peace presented a seasonable opportunity to regulate the practice of drawing on the Treasury for funds. On November 28, 1764, the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury adopted a resolution that no colonial governor or commander in chief should incur any expense not previously provided for by parliamentary grant or previously approved by His Majesty, but in case of sudden emergencies, if it was necessary to incur expense before approval could be obtained, bills of exchange might be drawn upon the Treasury. The system was a refinement of the former method of replenishing the Military Chest, and is a forerunner of the present provision in the Financial Administration Act for urgent and unforeseen expenses. The Treasury instructions to the colonial governors and commanders,¹⁰ setting forth the general procedure in connection with the expenditure of public moneys, limited those officials generally to disbursements that had been approved previously by Parliament.

However, to provide a means to meet urgent expenditures without the long delay which slow and uncertain ocean communications would otherwise have made inevitable, the Treasury Minute contained escape clauses providing:

... That if sudden and unforeseen emergencies should arise, where it is absolutely necessary that the service should be undertaken before His Majesty's pleasure can be known, or the necessary sums be granted by parliament for the purpose; such Governor or Commander in Chief may in these cases only, draw upon the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury, and on no other person whatsoever, and at the same time that he makes such draught he is to transmit to Their Lordships, as well as to the proper office, to whose department the service undertaken particularly belongs, information thereof with the reason why, consistently with the good of the service, it was not possible to delay incurring such expense until such time as the regulations above mentioned could be complied with.

¹⁰Haldimand Papers, B24, 13-14.

This was qualified by a warning:

That no bills will be accepted until the information above required be received, and that [the Governors and Commanders in Chief] will become accountants to His Majesty for the sums they shall respectively draw upon the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury, and that in passing and allowing their accounts for the expenditure of the same, Their Lordships will take into consideration not only the authenticity of the vouchers, but the urgent necessity of the services as undertaken, and the reasonableness of the prices at which the same were performed.¹¹

These bills of exchange drawn on the Treasury were used extensively by Murray, who sold them to merchants in Quebec who in turn transmitted them for presentation for payment in London.¹² The legality of imposing the customary French duties on the inhabitants of the province had been questioned and was under consideration in London,¹³ and consequently, with the authority for these impositions in doubt, the collection of the duties was not undertaken with the diligence that the colony's financial situation warranted, and the Governor was obliged to place increasing reliance on this form of treasury financing.

Meanwhile, a question as to how the public accounts should be audited had been raised in the colony. The Governor's commission provided for a general assembly of the free holders of the province, but no action to that end had been taken by Murray. Consequently, concerned with the possibility of taxation without representation and of unfettered expenditures, when the grand jury of Quebec convened on October 16, 1764, one of its presentments was:

We propose that the public accounts, be laid before the grand jury, at least twice a year to be examined and check'd by them and that they may be regularly settled every six months before them, which practice strictly adhered to, will very much prevent the abuses and confusion, too common in these matters.¹⁴

It was not until 1795 that the public accounts were tabled for the information of a Canadian assembly, but these presentments echoed the clash between the executive and the representatives of the people for the control of the purse, and are an indication that there was even then an awareness in the colony of the value of the audit as an instrument of financial control.

In London also, the question of a local audit of the provincial revenue had arisen, and Cholmondeley had been arranging for the appointment of a resident auditor at Quebec. His letters patent, dated

¹¹*Ibid.*

¹²Murray Papers, II, 218-19; Original Correspondence, Board of Trade, 1763-1837, C.O. 42, V, 88.

¹³Treasury Papers, T64, 188, 34; Shelburne Papers, LXIV, 67-8.

¹⁴Shortt and Doughty, *Documents*, I, 213.

November 20, 1752,¹⁵ authorized him or his sufficient deputy or deputies to audit "rents, revenues, prizes, fines, excheats, forfeitures, duties and profits whatsoever" due or payable to the Crown "in or from all or any of the several foreign dominions, islands, colonies and plantations in America." But although Cholmondeley had arranged to conduct a local audit of the provincial revenues, the Auditor General's right to audit the accounts of territories acquired and annexed to the Crown since the date of his patent was still in question. Early in 1764, Cholmondeley had presented a memorial to the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury¹⁶ requesting that William Matthew Burt, formerly His Majesty's agent in Guadeloupe, be directed to lay his accounts before the Auditor General for inspection and examination, and asking that an opinion be given on the general question of the Auditor General's right to audit the accounts of territories acquired since the date of his patent. On May 22, 1764, the matter was referred by Thomas Whately, the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Attorney and Solicitor General. On August 6, 1764, the opinion was given that Cholmondeley as Auditor General of North America was not entitled to pass the accounts of Burt or others under like circumstances where the Crown had only had temporary possession of the revenues in North America during the period of the war on the ground that it was not intended to have accounts passed merely for the purpose of creating fees for the auditor or to load the property which was restored at the end of the war with so heavy a charge. However, the point as to whether the authority of the auditor extended over the revenues arising from the conquered territories in North America was acknowledged to be a question of importance and difficulty. Although it was recognized that the newly conquered territories could not have been objects of the letters patent as they were not part of the Crown's dominion at the time the grant of the office was made, the words of the grant were very extensive and might by a literal construction be extended to include them. Consequently, the opinion was given that it would be proper that the point should be tried in the courts either in a feigned issue properly adopted to the question or in an action for money had and received which might be brought by Cholmondeley against a named person who must admit the receipt of the money and other matters in order to raise the doubt upon the letters patent.¹⁷

On October 11, 1764, Whately transmitted a copy of the Attorney and Solicitor General's opinion to Cholmondeley and advised him that if he was willing to try his right to audit the revenues arising from

¹⁵Secretary of State's Commissions, 1763-1777, 65-77.

¹⁶Treasury Papers, T64, CLXXXVIII, 12-14.

¹⁷*Ibid.*

territories in America which were not under the dominion of the Crown of Great Britain at the time of passing his patent, directions would be given to the Solicitor of the Treasury "to settle with him the proper method for bringing the question in issue and for proceeding to a speedy and final determination thereof."¹⁸

In Trinity Term, 1766, a bill for a test case was filed in the Exchequer Court with Cholmondeley as plaintiff and Burt as defendant, and the case was appointed to be heard on July 1, 1766.¹⁹ Research has failed to locate the judicial decision, but Cholmondeley's later activities and subsequent references to the office in official correspondence seem to imply that the decision in the test case upheld the Auditor General's right to audit the accounts of those territories passing under the administration of the Crown after the issuance of his patent.

Cholmondeley nominated the Reverend John Brooke, the chaplain of the garrison at Quebec, as deputy auditor of the revenues for the province.²⁰ The nomination was approved by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, and on January 14, 1764, Cholmondeley issued a commission to Brooke, with detailed instructions as to his audit duties.²¹

Although Walter Murray's commission as Receiver General did not specifically require him to present his accounts to the Legislative Council, in practice he or his deputy appeared regularly each half year before the Governor and Council and swore that the public accounts were just and true.²² On October 4, 1765, John Brooke, who had earlier taken up his audit duties, took his oath of office,²³ and when Richard Murray appeared before the council three days later to swear to his accounts, for the first time they were audited and signed by Brooke.²⁴

In the meantime, the imperial government had decided that the customary French duties might be legally collected from the inhabitants of the province. The Committee of the Privy Council on Plantation Affairs had directed the Attorney and Solicitor General to report how they should be collected, and had been advised that the proper procedure was to appoint a receiver general under the royal sign manual, with instructions from the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury as to the duties of the office.²⁵

Governor Murray, who had continued to urge that Walter Murray be given the King's commission as receiver general now learned that something more than Cholmondeley's nomination was required to

¹⁸*Ibid.*, T27, XXIX, 81.

¹⁹Andrews, *Guide*, II, 267.

²⁰Secretary of State's Commissions, 1763-1777, 78-9.

²¹*Ibid.*, 80-7.

²²Quebec Legislative Council Reports, B1, 30; B2, 231.

²³*Ibid.*, 96-7.

²⁴*Ibid.*, 110.

²⁵Murray Papers, III, 171-3; Treasury Papers, T64, CLXXXVIII, 34.

ensure the appointment. In January, 1765, Hector Theophilus Cramahé, the Civil Secretary, who had been sent to London with information for the imperial authorities with respect to colonial problems, wrote to the Governor:

You ought to write to the First Lord of Treasury in propria persona, about all such appointments as regard the revenues that being his particular province; Lord N—h and Mr. H—r have refused though applied to by your brother to interfere on behalf of Mr. Murray, as they say that it is the prerogative of him who presides at the board. . . .²⁶

Whether Murray appealed to George Grenville is not known, but in any event his efforts proved fruitless for, on July 10, 1765, as one of the last acts of the Grenville administration, Thomas Mills, a former adjutant in the town of Quebec, who had returned to England in 1762, was appointed by the King as Receiver General of the province, and on July 19 security was lodged by Mills in the office of His Majesty's Remembrancer of the Exchequer for the due execution of his office.²⁷ On November 22, 1765, an Order in Council was passed directing the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury to collect all or such part of the dues presently in force as they should judge necessary.²⁸ Mills's commission designated him as Receiver General "of all the royal patrimony, rents, revenues, farms, taxes, tithes, duties, imposts, profits, and casualties whatsoever (our revenue of customs always excepted) belonging unto us and which have arisen or shall arise within our province of Quebec."²⁹ On March 10, 1766, comprehensive instructions were issued by the Treasury,³⁰ specifying the duties which he was to collect and setting forth the procedure he was to follow in collecting, applying, and accounting for the revenues:

. . . and whereas it is necessary that regular accounts should be made and exhibited by such of His Majesty's officers who have had the management of any of his estates and revenues in the said Province since the conquest thereof, you are hereby strictly enjoined to demand of all the said officers exact and complete accounts of all sums of money of the duties, fines alienations, taxes and revenues of the Crown whatsoever, which have arisen and grown due to His Majesty and have been received for His Majesty's use by the said officers or any of them, and if any such duties and revenues are outstanding in the hands of the inhabitants, who ought to have paid the same, you are further strictly directed to make use of all legal methods for the recovery thereof; and you are generally to pursue and use all such legal ways and methods as may be necessary for the accounting for and recovering all monies due to His Majesty for any his said duties and revenues of and in the said Province from any person or persons whatsoever.

²⁶Murray Papers, III, 260.

²⁷Secretary of State's Commissions, 1763-1777, 47-8, 50.

²⁸Murray Papers, III, 171-3.

²⁹Secretary of State's Commissions, 1763-1777, 47-8.

³⁰*Ibid.*, 52-6.

... the proper officer to collect the duties upon importations ... is to account with you from time to time, and to pay the clear amounts of receipts into your hands for defraying the expenses of civil officers and contingencies of government in that Province.

You are to apply the monies which shall come to your hands of the said duties and revenues in the first place for and towards defraying the necessary expenses of government and the necessary charges of managing the revenue under your care; remitting home by good bills of exchange the surpluses of the monies which from time to time shall remain in your hands after payment of those expenses, in order that the same may be applied to the reimbursing to the publick here the monies which have been necessarily advanced for that Province by reason that the aforesaid duties and taxes have not been levied within the two years last past.

And lastly we charge and require you annually to transmit to the Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury for the time being exact accounts of all your receipts and payments and other your transactions in the premises taking care that duplicates thereof be sent by different ships to prevent the consequences of any miscarriage by dangers of the seas.

Mills arrived in Quebec in June, 1766,³¹ and in the following month entered upon the duties of his office, succeeding Walter Murray whose commission was automatically superseded when Mills presented his commission from the King.³² Almost immediately Mills came into conflict with the Council with regard to the scope of his authority. The source of the dispute lay in his instructions from the Treasury. It has been noted that General Murray's commission required that all issues of public moneys should be made by warrant of the Governor, with the advice and consent of his Council. Mills, however, claimed that he needed no warrant from the Governor in Council for any disbursements he might make for the public service,³³ and cited his commission and instructions as his warrant from the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury for issue as he saw fit. Moreover as his instructions called for an ultimate accounting to the imperial Treasury, to which he had pledged security and from which alone he could procure his quittance, he claimed exemption from a local audit of his transactions by the Council. Following Murray's recall to England in 1766, Paulus Aemelius Irving was sworn in as administrator of the province, and in August, 1766, hardly more than a month after Mills had assumed office, Irving was impelled to report to the Lords Commissioners for Trade and Plantations of the likelihood of confusion in the public service from the Receiver General's misunderstanding of his instructions.

... They do not mention his presenting his accounts to the Governor and Council, and he therefore claims an exemption from any instructions tho' for expenses incurred by their order, he says that the Governor and Council are to order the

³¹*Quebec Gazette*, July 3, 1766.

³²Quebec Legislative Council Reports, B2, 240.

³³Colonial Correspondence—Canada (Quebec) Q3, 247-8.

service, and he is to contract for it as he pleases, nor does he require any warrant from the Governor and Council for the disbursements he may make in consequence; a doctrine contrary to the practice in other colonies, fraught with so many obviously bad consequences that I suppose there can be no authority for his advancing it: it is but just that the Governor and Council, whose reputations depend upon being frugal of the public money should not only be the judges of the propriety of any services they order; but likewise of the reasonableness of the expenses incurred in execution of it.³⁴

The fact that the Governor was personally responsible for ensuring due economy in the public expenditure and, when money ran out, was personally liable for the bills he drew on the Treasury show that Mills's claim to make disbursements without reference to Council was unpractical and unrealistic. The issue was not to be readily settled, and until Mills's return to England in 1767, the conflict between the Council and the Receiver General continued, although it appears that for the greater part of the time the administrator's will prevailed for the public accounts were presented to Council and examined by a committee appointed to review them.³⁵ Of Mills's relations with Cholmondeley's deputy in Quebec there is no conclusive evidence. The Receiver General's commission and instructions contain no mention of an audit by the Auditor General or his local representative, and it might seem that a refusal to submit his accounts for Brooke's scrutiny would be wholly in harmony with his defiance of the Governor and Council. Moreover, there is no reference to be found in the Minutes of Council to Brooke's audit activities from the time of Mills's arrival in Quebec to the date of Brooke's departure in 1768.³⁶ However, a local audit on Cholmondeley's behalf may have been performed for both the Receiver General and the Auditor were Treasury officials; any question in dispute could be readily resolved by a reference to the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, and it cannot be assumed that they would be ready to acquiesce in any proposal to discontinue or postpone the audit. If a deputy auditor was resident in the colony after Brooke's departure, it is not likely that his dealings were marked by those disputes over conflicting authority which were characteristic of the relations between the Receiver General on the one hand and the Governor and Council on the other, and which had been reflected and perpetuated by similar conflicts and jealousies between government departments in London.

In July, 1767, Mills sought, and was granted, leave of absence to discuss the state of the provincial treasury with officials in London.³⁷ His commission did not grant him authority to appoint a deputy, and

³⁴*Ibid.*

³⁵Quebec Legislative Council Reports, B2, 301, 334.

³⁶Quebec Gazette, July 7, 15, 1768.

³⁷Original Correspondence, Board of Trade, 1763-1837, C.O. 42, VI, 58-9.

accordingly on August 15, 1767, Guy Carleton as Lieutenant Governor issued a commission as Acting Receiver General to Hector Theophilus Cramahé "to exercise all the powers and receive and enjoy all the profits and advantages lawfully belonging thereunto, granted and allowed to Mills and to follow the instructions from the Lords of the Treasury."³⁸ As an appointee of Carleton, Cramahé was disinclined to continue Mills's conflict with the Governor and Council, and for some years thereafter, the Receiver General's accounts were produced and sworn to in Council and examined in committee regularly each half year prior to their transmission to London. In 1770, on Carleton's return to England, Cramahé became administrator of the province, and on July 31, Thomas Dunn, a member of the committee on public accounts, was appointed acting receiver general,³⁹ an office which he held until 1777. During Dunn's tenure of office, as during Cramahé's, the Receiver General's accounts were submitted regularly for examination by a committee of the Legislative Council, and the disputes which marked the period of Mills's active tenure did not arise.

³⁸Internal Correspondence, Quebec, 1760-1841, s13, no. 69.

³⁹*Ibid.*, s14, no. 130.

The Wintering Partners and the Hudson's Bay Company, 1867-1879

DUANE C. TWAY

IN 1867, the wintering partners of the Hudson's Bay Company, who traded with the Indians for the Company, shared the profits of that trade. This had been their source of remuneration since the merger of the Northwest Company and the Hudson's Bay Company in 1821.¹ At that time the directors apparently believed that if the remuneration of the wintering partners depended upon the size of the profit, they would be more diligent in their trading and profits would be greater. Events between 1867 and 1879 were to prove this theory faulty in practice and unpopular with the wintering partners.

The relationship between the Company and the wintering partners was regulated by the Deed Poll of 1821, as amended in 1834.² This document stipulated that the net profit of the fur trade would be divided, sixty per cent going to the Company and forty to the wintering partners. These men, officially called the commissioned officers of the fur trade, were assisted by clerks and servants who were paid fixed salaries as part of the expense of the trade. The commissioned officers, chief factors and chief traders, shared the forty per cent which was subdivided into eighty-five shares. Twenty-five chief factors received fifty shares, twenty-eight chief traders received twenty-eight shares, and seven shares were set aside as a retirement fund. Upon retirement each officer or his family was provided for from this fund for a period not exceeding seven years. Since the retirement fund was provided from the profits earned by the wintering partners, each officer had a vested interest in it. If at any time the Deed Poll were to be altered it

¹Hudson's Bay Company, *Copy of Deed Poll, 26 March 1821*, photostatic copy, Library, University of California at Los Angeles.

²*Ibid.*

probably would be necessary to pay each officer a lump sum equal to his share of the retirement fund. Such became the case in 1870-1.

By a charter from Charles II, the Company held a monopoly of trade and land in those areas which drained into Hudson Bay. With the beginning of western expansion in Canada in the middle of the nineteenth century the land rights of the Company suddenly seemed highly valuable. The International Financial Society purchased the Company's stock in 1863 for £500,000 and reorganized the company with a capitalization of £2 million, half of which was the value placed upon its land in Canada.³

At once the new Company sought ways to realize profit from the land. Negotiations with the imperial government and with Canada led in 1869 to a surrender of the Company's rights in Rupert's Land. The price was £300,000, one-twentieth of the land in the fertile belt, and approximately 50,000 acres around the Company's posts.

During this period of turmoil the wintering partners, interested only in the fur trade and viewing land speculation with mistrust and misgiving, came to feel that they had been neglected and possibly cheated.⁴ First, they believed that the old Company had broken a solemn contract when it sold to the International Financial Society without giving prior notice to its wintering partners. Then the new management had surrendered its monopoly in Rupert's Land to Canada. Yet, the experience of the invasion of the Company's monopoly of the fur trade prior to 1821 by the Northwest Company seemingly had proved that monopoly was essential to profit. The officers' current income gave credence to their fears. Although their remuneration had averaged well over £250 per share for the past fifteen years, in 1867-8 it had fallen to £72.⁵ The commissioned officers united and sent Donald A. Smith to London to request a change of the Deed Poll.⁶ By 1870 the Company had agreed and the new Deed Poll became operative in 1871.⁷

³*Prospectus of the Hudson's Bay Company*, (London, 1863), photostatic copy, Library, University of California at Los Angeles. For a thorough exposition of these negotiations see J. S. Galbraith, "The Hudson's Bay Land Controversy, 1863-69," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XXXVI (3), Dec., 1949.

⁴Duane C. Tway, "The Wintering Partners and the Hudson's Bay Company, 1863-1871," *Canadian Historical Review*, XXXIII (1), March, 1952, 52-3.

⁵*Proceedings of the General Court of the Hudson's Bay Company* (henceforth cited as *Proceedings*), June, 1871, 38, gives the average for the ten years previous to 1869 as £275. Edward Watkin in his *Canada and the United States*, 157, gives £408 as the average for 1846-58. In a letter to Governor Dallas from a chief factor, Canada, *Sessional Papers*, 19, 1867-8, I, 7 the figure £426 is given for the period 1853-62. The figure given here is obviously a most conservative estimate.

⁶Beckles Willson, *Life of Lord Strathcona* (New York, 1915), I, 421, and Tway, "The Wintering Partners."

⁷*Proceedings*, July 13, 1871, 55-6.

The Company's decision to abrogate the old Deed Poll and to write another was not arrived at easily. Throughout this critical era there were no more stormy meetings of the stockholders than the four held in June and July 1871, at which this decision was finally reached.⁸ At the first of these a group of shareholders proposed that the fur trade be abandoned. Some shareholders even suggested that the fur trade business be given to the wintering partners.⁹ Such proposals had some attraction in 1871. In 1865-6 a share of Hudson's Bay stock had paid a dividend of £1 2s. but this had dropped to 18s. the following year and to 12s. in 1867-8. It had fallen again in 1869-70 to 4s. and although it had risen the next year to 10s.,¹⁰ it was not unexpected that some shareholders might suggest the abandonment of the fur trade. Obviously it must either be abandoned or rearranged. To do this, as the Governor, Sir Stafford Northcote, told the shareholders, the Deed Poll must be changed and that would involve paying the wintering partners over £107,000. Some of the shareholders could not understand the necessity for this payment. Both the Governor and the solicitor explained that the payment was necessary to deal justly with the commissioned officers, and to buy out their rights to the retirement fund.¹¹

Governor Northcote agreed that the trade had not been very profitable in the recent past. But, he maintained, this was not due to a lack of furs. On the contrary the take of furs had been increasing. Whereas in the years 1860-2 the amount had varied from 223 to 276 thousand pounds of furs, in 1867 and 1868 it had risen to 300 and 347 thousand pounds respectively. The primary explanation for the decreasing profits was the increasing cost of transportation. This in turn was due to the unsettled conditions at Red River which had made it more difficult to obtain Indians to work the transport canoes and portages.

The Red River disturbances had abated by 1871 and the Company was now considering the steps necessary to improve transportation by putting steamers on the inland waters. Furthermore, rail transportation

⁸*Ibid.*, June 28, 29, July 12, 13, 1871.

⁹*Ibid.*, June 28, 1871, 4, 12.

¹⁰Hudson's Bay Company, *Report*, July 5, 1866; July 7, 1868; July 2, 1869; July 5, 1870; Nov. 22, 1870. *Proceedings*, July 4, 1867, and June 28, 1871.

¹¹The sum actually paid to the wintering partners in 1871 was £107,055. As Governor Northcote explained on July 12, 1871, this figure was the result of a compromise. Donald A. Smith representing the partners had agreed to take £75,000 as settlement of the retirement fund provided the partners received their share of the money paid the Company by the United States for the claims of the Puget Sound Agricultural Society. Legal opinion taken by the company assured it that the partners had no right to so share. However, what appeared to be equally valid opinion had assured the partners that they did possess such a right. To avoid litigation the Committee had decided to give the officers £30,000 as a bonus. See *Proceedings*, June and July 1871, esp. July 12, 1871, 13 and *Report*, June 28, 1872, 5.

would soon reach out to Manitoba both from Canada and the United States. Although the report laid before the shareholders in June, 1871, admitted that the Company was in a critical position, the Governor assured the meeting that there was no cause for alarm. With the word "critical" the directors had hoped to convey that Company affairs had come to a crisis, and that sweeping changes were necessary if conditions were to be improved.¹²

To improve the fur trade certain alterations were necessary. In addition, the directors proposed to open a new business retailing supplies to immigrants. To open this business, and to realize profit from the land which the Company owned in Canada, the Indians must be kept pacific. Intending to work toward that end, the Canadian government had suggested via the Prime Minister, Sir John A. Macdonald, that "it would be of advantage to us, and no doubt of advantage to you, that we should be allowed to use your officers and your posts for the purpose of making these payments to the Indians which will have to be made annually by the Government of Canada, in order to satisfy their claims (to the land) and to keep them in good humor."¹³

These arguments convinced the shareholders to approve the new Deed Poll. Under it the wintering partners were engaged to carry on "for the said Governor and Company trade and commerce, including not only Fur Trade, but all such other trades or businesses and commercial transactions, either connected with the Fur Trade or not, which the said Governor and the Company shall think fit to carry on or be engaged in from time to time."¹⁴ With the words "all such other trades or businesses and commercial transactions" was born the business of retail trading for which the Hudson's Bay Company is today famous.

Under the new Deed Poll, the wintering partners were to receive forty per cent of the profit, which would be divided into one hundred shares. There were now five categories of officers. Four chief factors, with superintending and inspecting duties, would each receive three of the one hundred shares; eight chief factors would receive two and one-half shares each; twenty factors two shares; ten chief traders one and one-half shares; and eight junior chief traders one share. The duties of the last four classes of officers were to be regulated by a chief commissioner appointed by the Company. His salary would be charged two-thirds to the fur trade and one-third to the Company. The five shares remaining were applied to a fund which, in contrast to the terms

¹²*Proceedings*, June 28, 1871, 1-6.

¹³*Ibid.*, 9-10.

¹⁴Hudson's Bay Company, *Deed Poll*, 20 March 1871, photostatic copy, Library, University of California at Los Angeles.

of the old Deed Poll, was not a retirement fund in which the officers had a legal interest but was to be used by the Governor and Committee for the officers' benefit. Thus the Company avoided the possibility of having to buy up retiring interests if it should at some future time wish to change the Deed Poll of 1871.

The officers were to serve the Company for five years unless sickness or decision of the Company terminated service earlier. An officer who left the Company was not to engage in the fur trade for two years thereafter. Dismissal by the Company required twelve months notice except for "willful neglect of duty or other misconduct" for which the officers might be immediately dismissed. The officers were to be provided subsistence and personal necessities. They were assured furloughs; inspecting chief factors to have six months every five years, the other officers six months every seven years.

In November, 1871, the shareholders accepted the new Deed Poll.¹⁵ The following June the Governor assured the proprietors that the Deed Poll had been accepted by all the officers concerned. By way of appraising the results of the change he added: "Therefore we have, I think, a contented as well as an experienced and able body of men representing our interests out there; and, from the nature of the arrangement that has been made, their interests are identical with our own. They will be as anxious to push our general business as to push the particular business of the fur trade."¹⁶ Therein lay the virtue of the Deed Poll of 1871. Through it the two hundred-year-old Hudson's Bay Company evidenced a vitality and an ability to adjust to changing conditions in Canada.

During the next few years business became better than at any time since 1863.¹⁷ Net profits rose steadily; in 1872 over £85,522 was realized, in 1873 more than £99,188. This increased to over £111,768 in 1874 and in 1875 to 114,991. Naturally the remuneration of the wintering partners also improved. The value per share leaped from £199 in 1871-2 to £367 in 1872-3, dropped slightly to £321 in 1873-4 but rose again to £378 in 1874-5. Dividends to shareholders increased accordingly from 17 shillings in 1872 to 20 in 1873 and 1874, and finally to 23 in 1875.

The Governor confronted shareholders who were in high spirits at the meeting in June, 1875. A twenty-three-shilling dividend warmed their pockets. Governor Goschen referred to the wintering partners with respect and admiration. He believed that the high profits of

¹⁵*Ibid.*, Nov. 21, 1871, 13.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, June 28, 1872, 3-4.

¹⁷The tables given here have been compiled from the financial statements facing page 8 of each of the following *Reports*: June 28, 1872, July 1, 1873, June 30, 1874, and June 29, 1875.

recent years were owed in large part to their energy and zeal. Several persons not connected with the Company had made remarks to him indicating the highest admiration for the Company's staff. Their courtesy to travellers was exemplary and they carried on business with tact and diligence. He felt that the Government of Canada appreciated the aid the wintering partners had given in managing the Indian tribes. This facility he called "an almost hereditary skill" and stated that because of it Canada had been spared difficulties with the Indians, "which had occurred to the south of their possessions."¹⁸

Although the profits and the dividends reported in 1875 were high, the world was already in depression, and when the Hudson's Bay Company furs went on sale in the spring of 1876 prices had fallen. Beaver was down twelve and one-half per cent, marten twenty per cent, mink fifty per cent, otter twenty per cent, and bear ten per cent. According to Governor Goschen the world situation was responsible. He reassured the proprietors that they had every reason to be satisfied with the ability displayed by the wintering partners.¹⁹

At the beginning of the depression the directors decided to retrench. They proposed, and the shareholders agreed, to make some alterations in the Deed Poll of 1871. Changing conditions in the Company's retail business and fur trade, as well as the experience gained in the management thereof were given as the reasons for the modifications. The basic need was for more officers in the lower grades. Consequently Article IV of the Deed Poll of 1871 was amended so that there would be three inspecting chief factors in place of four; there would remain eight chief factors; the number of factors was reduced from twenty to fifteen and the junior chief traders were increased from eight to twenty-one. A further clause was added giving the Governor and Committee authority to "alter or vary" the number of officers in each grade as circumstances might require.²⁰

The depression continued. A dividend of fifteen shillings was declared in 1876, but in 1877 and 1878 there were none.²¹ Prices of fur continued downward. Beaver dropped from 13s. 11d. in 1874, to 9s. in 1877; marten from 20s. to 12s.²² The causes were obvious. Russia, then a large buyer of furs, had been especially hard hit by the depression, and when she declared war on Turkey in the spring of 1877

¹⁸*Proceedings*, June 29, 1875, 1-2. (George J. Goschen succeeded Sir Stafford Northcote as governor in March, 1874.)

¹⁹*Ibid.*, June 27, 1876, 3-5.

²⁰*Report*, June 27, 1876, 9-12, and *Proceedings*, June 27, 1876, 9. See also Hudson's Bay Company, *Deed Poll, 1871 as amended June 27, 1876* (London, 1887), in the Library, University of California at Los Angeles.

²¹*Report*, June 27, 1876, 5, June 26, 1877, 5-7, and June 25, 1878, 9.

²²*Proceedings*, June 26, 1877, 3.

her demand for furs decreased still further. The lack of rapid communications with the wintering partners had also contributed to the Company's losses. There was an interval of one to two years between the time the Company became aware of decreasing fur prices and the time the partners could be instructed to reduce the price they paid for furs.²³ In the winter of 1877-8 the scarcity of reindeer and moose had worked hardship on the Indians. This in turn affected the Company, for the Indians had to be kept alive for material as well as moral considerations.²⁴

At the June, 1877 meeting the stockholders learned that the Company had lost £2,911 for the year 1876-7. The Governor assured the shareholders that the wintering partners were in no way responsible for the poor financial circumstances of the Company.²⁵ In November, 1877, the shareholders learned that fur prices had fallen still lower, as had the prices received for retail merchandise in the Company's shops.²⁶

The directors were convinced, by the increasing amounts of furs returned from Canada, that there was no lack of energy by the wintering partners. Therefore they were not willing that the officers should go a second year without remuneration for their efforts.²⁷ They proposed, in June, 1878, to pay the officers £100 per share. Since there were some vacancies this would require the sum of £9,200. Of this, £5,068 was to be taken from the fund established in 1871 for the benefit of the officers. The directors would give one-half their yearly salary, £1,750. And the remaining £2,382 was to be drawn from Company funds.²⁸ When the stockholders learned that the Company had lost £28,393 for the year 1877-8, there was some criticism of giving this money to the wintering partners but the plan carried.²⁹

By the fall of 1878 the fur market was emerging from the depression. At the spring sales in 1879 prices continued to improve.³⁰ In the year 1878-9 the company realized a profit of £46,753 and the wintering partners received £32 per share.³¹

Going without remuneration for one year, and receiving remuneration the second year *via* a temporary expedient arranged by the kindness of the directors, was an object lesson to the wintering partners.

²³*Ibid.*, 3-4.

²⁴*Report*, June 25, 1878, 8.

²⁵*Ibid.*, June 26, 1877, 7 and *Proceedings*, June 26, 1877, 4.

²⁶*Proceedings*, Nov. 27, 1877, 2-5.

²⁷*Ibid.*, 4, 7.

²⁸*Report*, June 25, 1878, 10-11.

²⁹*Proceedings*, June 25, 1878, 11-12.

³⁰*Report*, Nov. 26, 1878, 5 and June 24, 1879, 5.

³¹*Ibid.*, June 24, 1879, 6, 11. (The share has been computed by this writer from the Appropriation Account facing page 11.)

They proposed to the Company that they should be guaranteed a minimum of £200 per share. The directors believed that was too high. A compromise was effected with no permanent alteration of the Deed Poll necessary. The wintering partners were guaranteed a minimum of £150 per share for five years beginning in 1879. If in any year during that period a profit of £60,000 was made the officers would get the £200 they had originally desired. It was stipulated that this arrangement in no way conferred "upon the Commissioned Officers any rights or privileges to which they would not otherwise be entitled under the . . . Deed Poll."³²

At the same time the Governor and Committee made two proposals to amend the Deed Poll, which were also accepted by the shareholders.³³ The five shares which had formerly been put into a fund for the benefit of retired officers or their families were put to different use. Hereafter the Deed Poll read: "And the remaining five shares may be appropriated by the said Governor and Company, or their Committee, to the Officers for the time being of the Company, in the proportions in which such Officers may be entitled to the above mentioned 95 shares."³⁴ This slightly increased the remuneration of the wintering partners.

The second amendment concerned the provision, in the Deed Poll of 1871, that the Company need not employ the full number of officers authorized in Article IV. If vacancies were left, the shares appertaining to them were divided, sixty per cent to the company and forty per cent to the active officers. This had given rise to protest from the wintering partners.³⁵ They felt that if vacancies were not filled the burden of the work of those positions would fall upon the remaining officers, who therefore should have the profit of the vacancies. On the other hand the Company hesitated to give the wintering partners the full proceeds from vacant offices. To do so would be to give the officers too great an interest in the posts being vacant. As disciplinary action under the Deed Poll could be taken against an officer by fellow officers, it was not inconceivable that senior officers might dismiss the younger officers in order to get the latter's shares of the profits.

Again a compromise was adopted and written into the Deed Poll under Article IV. The sixty per cent of vacant shares which had formerly gone to the Company would henceforth be used to create a "Fur Trade Officers Reserve Fund." This would be at the disposition of the Governor and Committee for the benefit of the wintering part-

³²*Ibid.*, 7, and *Proceedings*, June 24, 1879, 3-4.

³³*Proceedings*, June 24, 1879, 12.

³⁴*Report*, June 24, 1879, 8.

³⁵*Proceedings*, June 24, 1879, 4.

ners in active service or, thereafter, for their families. The officers were permitted to make recommendations for the disposal of the fund.³⁶

By 1879 the fortunes of the Hudson's Bay Company were on the rise. As settlers moved into the prairies and transportation improved, land values increased, retail sales improved, and, in spite of dire predictions to the contrary, the fur trade profits increased. The wintering partners, last stalwarts of the old order, had distrusted the Company until 1871. Thereafter the rapport between the Company and its officers improved immensely. The story of the relations between the Company and the wintering partners during the critical period 1867-79, is a creditable chapter in the history of the Hudson's Bay Company.

³⁶*Report*, June 24, 1879, 8.

The Dynamic Commonwealth**JOHN CONWAY**

THERE IS probably no era in modern European history that requires re-examination and re-analysis more urgently than does the epoch of imperialist expansion in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. We are experiencing its unexpected aftermath in our sudden confrontation after the Second World War with China, India, Egypt, and a host of lesser powers not as suzerainties requiring our guidance and assistance but as nations who are only too aware that the balance of power may have shifted decisively from the European world to the Orient and to Africa. This phenomenon is of our own making. The need to understand it has an importance beside which European diplomatic history seems to be little more than an anti-quarian pursuit. Germany, France, Italy, and Russia all, as the nineteenth century developed, annexed territories and mapped out spheres of influence. All were, or became, empires. Without any question however the most striking achievement of the age was the British Empire and Commonwealth. It is in this chapter of British history therefore that imperialism can best be studied.

When the reign of Victoria opened, the realm of the Crown was still considered to be mainly the British Isles. British foreign policy was directed exclusively to relations with continental Europe. In various parts of the world, at Gibraltar, Malta, and the Cape of Good Hope, strategic outposts had been acquired; islands in the West Indies remained as a legacy from the exploratory efforts of earlier centuries. But these foreign possessions were usually the accidental outcome of European warfare, never the result of a purposeful and co-ordinated imperial policy. India was a trading company; British North America a remote and unimportant string of frontier settlements governed from Whitehall for the negative reason that it was deemed wise to assert British power against the rising strength of the American Republic. "I've been to Marylebone," says Phineas Finn, "to find out what the people there think about the Canadas." "And what do they think about the Canadas?" asks his friend. "Not one man in a thousand," replies Phineas, "cares whether the Canadians prosper or fail to prosper. They care that Canada should not go to the States because, though they don't love the Canadians, they do hate the Americans." This view can be taken as characteristic of the first decades of the nineteenth century in England. None of the foreign or British territories scattered in so haphazard a manner throughout the world was regarded as integral in a final sense either to British power or to Britain's view of herself. England alone mattered; it was in the interests of England that a continental power must be prevented from achieving mastery over Europe. Most important

of all the Englishman's image of himself and his country was limited to the still largely non-industrial island he had inherited, filled as it was with the relics of his private and local history, and peopled by men and women of his own racial stock who shared a common religion, common values, and a common political outlook.

There are those who have said (Henri Bourassa in Canada was the most brilliantly vocal of them) that in essence this attitude never changed; that as the Empire developed it was regarded and used by Downing Street principally as a weapon to protect and extend interests that continued to be those of England alone. Be that as it may, the fact remains that at the end of the Victorian age the world view of the British people had undergone a serious modification. Some four hundred million people, most of them black, brown, or yellow, inhabiting about eleven million square miles of the surface of the globe, acknowledged willingly or with varying degrees of reluctance the sovereignty of the Crown. Joseph Chamberlain was assiduously advocating a political federation of this enormous dominion; Rudyard Kipling was expressing lyrically convictions which Dilke, Cramb, and Seeley had already elaborated in prose; the novels of Henty raised the eyes of English schoolboys to horizons far more exotic and exciting than those that encompassed the City and had satisfied the generation of Mr. Pickwick. The coronation of the Queen, for all its traditional magnificence, had been a homely affair in contrast with the gorgeous panoply of her Diamond Jubilee and that contrast marks the change. England had become an Empire and Englishmen had become, or thought they had become, men with a mission. It was by now a political mission, and not only or even mainly to their own kind. The responsibility, the trust was to millions of people with cultural backgrounds very different from that of western Europe and in varying stages of development, people not a few of whom could be described with fair accuracy by Kipling as "half-devil and half-child."

What had happened? This is the important question because the civilizing mission was a success. Its outcome, true, was unexpected. No imperial federation took place. The slow development from protectorate to crown colony to self-government and finally dominion status, a goal usually achieved only after generations of education and training, experienced a sudden and hurried acceleration in the years after the Second World War. Moreover, the aim of those who had been the white man's burden seemed to be independence—a transitional stage being accepted only when it suited the precise needs of the British subjects involved. Dominion status, that wonderful metaphysical creation of Lord Balfour, could hardly exist as an end any more. Had not Mackenzie King and St. Laurent succeeded quietly in abolishing it? None the less the mission was a success. The conversion was complete. It was not on the basis of the teachings of the Buddha that India became a republic. Nor did China rouse herself from anarchy and decay by means of a Confucian inspiration. Kipling in the end was proved wrong. The twain could and did meet. They met in a common study and acceptance of the teachings of Locke, Burke, Mill, and Karl Marx. It was certainly one of the most momentous encounters history has to record.

What had caused it? This question is crucial because its answer will define the bearing of the West towards the resurgent Orient. Is our posture to be one of guilt and repentance? The question requires a much more precise and unemotional examination than either the friends or the critics of imperialism have given it. So far the critics seem to have won the day. The orthodoxy of the schools has on the whole been that expressed by Marx and developed by J. A. Hobson. Imperialism, it was said, was the expression of capitalism in its later stages. The accumulation

of surplus capital, the need for new markets impelled the industrialized European powers to look for and exploit undeveloped areas and peoples in Africa and in the Middle and Far East. Any protestations of disinterestedness, or major concern for backward peoples were to be viewed as a screen, deliberate or unconscious, for simple economic motivation. When Curzon said "In Empire we have found not merely the key to glory and wealth, but the call to duty and the means of service to mankind," liberal opinion would accept the first part of that statement and discard the second as a sentimental Edwardian illusion. Liberal-left opinion in Great Britain without exception endorsed this interpretation. It happened to coincide with deeply held convictions in the American Republic. There, for the liberals it was simple orthodoxy; for the conservative-minded it was accepted for another reason; and to the school of rugged individualism capitalist exploitation was self-justifying. Why bother to add an unnecessary gloss on self-evident truths? For both liberal and conservative there was the feeling, deep in the foundations of American history, that any form of colonialism or imperialism was of its nature bad. This automatic and somewhat unreflective separation of the sheep from the goats was to have interesting and perhaps not wholly desirable consequences in the last phases of the Second World War.

The tory imperialist on the other hand was convinced of the reality and importance of his mission. Much too pragmatic to ignore the economic and financial side of the imperial venture he nevertheless was assured that his efforts were in fact directed towards the ultimate well-being of the peoples whom he now ruled, usually with an autocratic hand. He could point to the Indian Civil Service, to the long line of devoted viceroys, to the high degree of success achieved in the areas of hygiene, famine control, agriculture, and the administration of justice. He could point also to the fact that his rule was as often as not accepted with eagerness by the masses of the native peoples. The political agitators were a minority obstructing practical progress in the interests of impractical political ideals. Without doubt there was a good deal of truth in his asseverations. If Rhodes and the Rand millionaires hardly expressed the highest form of detached idealism, it could hardly be denied that John and Henry Lawrence represented quite a different tradition and achievement.

How then is the argument to be resolved? It is to this question that Professor Thornton directs his attention in *The Imperial Idea and Its Enemies*.¹ His treatment of the subject is certainly the most valuable contribution in recent years to a proper understanding of this crucial episode in British history. It is, as well, an interesting case study in historical development containing lessons which have a broader application than to the immediate topic. And it is written in a non-dogmatic, non-emotional manner which gives the debate a perspective which it badly needs. He describes the relatively innocent origins of the imperial idea, its transformation during the course of the nineteenth century by reason of imponderables which could hardly have been foreseen, the strains to which it was submitted in two world wars, and its almost complete vanquishment in our own time.

The imperial idea, he tells us, was the child of two beliefs deeply held in Great Britain in the first half of the nineteenth century. These were the laissez-faire economic philosophy of the Manchester School and the missionary zeal of the non-conformist aspect of British Christianity. The transmutation of these ideas in the context of a Europe that changed in a drastic manner both politically and philo-

¹A. P. Thornton, *The Imperial Idea and Its Enemies: A Study in British Power*. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd. [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1959. Pp. xvi, 370. \$5.75.

sophically during the ensuing fifty years resulted in the jingoistic imperialism of the Edwardian era which was far from the original attitude and open to attack in its principles and policies. For the mid-Victorian, free competition at home and abroad needed no apology for it was an essential component of progress; it contained the only real hope of material betterment for men whether they lived in Bengal or in Lancashire. Spiritual betterment reposed in Protestant Christian dogmas which should ideally be made available to those who so far had not experienced them. These twin convictions made not only possible but desirable (and, in fact, a matter of duty) British economic and cultural penetration of her already not inconsiderable overseas possessions.

So long as overseas expansion was left pretty much to Great Britain, so long as laissez-faire represented an effort to create goods and not to protect a vested interest, and so long as the country's internal and imperial affairs were directed by the educated and unemotional upper classes, the mainsprings of the imperial idea were probably as simple and innocent as they asserted themselves to be. But this happy period was not of long duration. The transformation began shortly after the century entered its final thirty years. First of all, the new picture of Europe after the unification of Italy and Germany changed dependencies which could be viewed with reasonable detachment into strategic areas upon which the safety of the British Isles, together with British prestige, could be argued to depend. The argument was made all the more telling when Great Britain began to lose her early industrial supremacy to the United States and to the German Empire. The decision of France, Italy, and Germany that they too needed African and Oriental empires precipitated the scramble for undeveloped non-European territories that characterised the closing years of the century. An England whose industrial power was now being seriously challenged could not be left behind in the race for new sources of raw material and new markets. Finally, the suffrage reform measures of 1867 and 1884 introduced a democratic electorate. In a real sense the mass of the people were becoming the rulers and these new rulers partly created, partly responded to the jingoism which now replaced the dry bureaucratic commitment of the Colonial Office as the dynamic behind further expansion. That expansion had now become so vast and the struggle with competing powers so clear that the average man tended to identify himself with the dramatic and colourful events in which his country was participating and to respond to those political leaders who presented the imperial destiny and mission most vividly. At times much too vividly. As Professor Thornton remarks, "Patriotism may not necessarily be the last refuge of scoundrels, but very often it is the first platform of fools."

It was in this setting that we see the imperial idea at its zenith. The original attitude towards dependencies beyond the seas was still strong enough to give a skeleton of genuinely high principle to a mood and a policy which were now concerned in the main with British prestige and power first of all rather than with the interests of the subject peoples. It is at this point that one criticism of Professor Thornton's thesis arises. On the whole he ignores the change in the intellectual climate of Europe which occurred during the nineteenth century. It can be argued that the emotional imperialism of the Diamond Jubilee is not fully understandable without reference to the development that had taken place between the thought of John Stuart Mill and the thought of Nietzsche. Social Darwinism is surely a more important component of jingo imperialism than Professor Thornton seems to perceive. In fact Darwin, Nietzsche, and Marx have this in common—that each in a different way replaces the eighteenth-century idea of natural harmony, under which the early Empire had developed, with the idea of natural struggle. This accept-

ance of struggle and heroism as the central fact of history and experience goes a good way to explain the peculiarly perfervid quality of patriotism in the British world on the eve of the Boer War.

To this imperial idea Professor Thornton says the next half century was to present a multiplicity of challenges. There was the challenge of the Boer War itself and the two World Wars. There was the challenge of competing empires. There was the domestic challenge of a democratic electorate become radical and socialist. And finally there was the challenge of nationalism from the subject peoples themselves whose leaders had by now been fully converted to the political doctrines of the West. None but the hardiest of imperialists could view the Boer War and its outcome with a completely clear conscience. The economic motive had been so blatant and the bullying psychology so apparent that imperialism was never quite the same afterwards. Certainly the province of Quebec from the beginning viewed the affair from the Boer point of view and it took all the power and charm of Laurier to negotiate the episode without disaster. The two great wars of the century challenged the imperial idea by questioning its first premise—the ability of Great Britain to maintain herself as the world's major power. In the first of these the outcome was inconclusive even though the Central Powers were defeated. The League of Nations was itself an anti-imperialist conception, ineffective though it was. Moreover in the interwar period the approach to imperial affairs in the Dominions was as self-centredly practical as Bourassa had always accused Whitehall of being. "In Dominion opinion," says Professor Thornton, "the adjective best derived from Empire was not imperial but empirical." The Second World War made undeniable what had been implicit at the conclusion of the first. England was not able to defend and keep her Empire unassisted. Not metaphorically but in dire reality she called in the New World to redress the balance of the Old.

Interestingly enough, however, she had no particular desire to keep that Empire any longer, as the remarkable decision of the electorate in 1945 made amply clear. Prepared to fight in her remote outposts so as to keep her own islands safe, when the war came to an end the imperial fervour was found to be exhausted. For since the Boer War two developments had taken place which complemented each other and co-operated to bring about the present condition of the Empire-Commonwealth. In the first place, under the influence of Fabian and Labour party teaching, the English democracy had matured and been educated. Nor was this influence restricted to the democracy. Such is the pervasiveness of ideas that a Socialist Prime Minister could send a kinsman of the monarch to liquidate the Raj. One thinks of the Duke of Connaught as viceroy little more than twenty years earlier. To this new electorate the imperial mission, if it existed, was a mission to the centre of the Empire, not to its fringes. The welfare of the English people had a stronger claim on the energies and gifts of English statesmen than had Egyptians, Pakistanis, and Burmese. And Hitler, by carrying emotional politics to a hysterical and dangerous conclusion, had made all appeals based on emotion suspect and fatiguing. Secondly, in taking themselves to non-Western lands the Western nations had inevitably brought nationalism along with them. It had not taken the more intelligent of their new subjects long to realize wherein lay the strength of their new rulers. Power and well-being were not to be had from the religious and philosophical foundations of the ancient cultures themselves. They were to be had in the fund of ideas which had propelled these energetic Westerners into countries that did not belong to them. England in particular did her best to inculcate these new truths.

Nehru, if he owed part of his political education to periods spent in British prisons, owed most of it to years spent at one of the most eminent of English

public schools and at one of the two great English universities. The fact that it was a fellow-Harrowian who brought finally to an end Churchill's Indian Empire deserves a good deal of thoughtful reflection. The civilizing mission had indeed been a success. It had given that distinctive Western idea, the libertarian nation state, to peoples who had never heard of it before; and more than that it had trained native leaders to understand what could be done with the concept and how to do it. Any queries about the value of the historical episode that made this contribution possible come more properly from the imperialists who, rather inadvertently, were responsible for it, than from the subject peoples who profited from it and made it their own.

Were the aims, then, of the imperialist creed frustrated? Professor Thornton thinks not. Or at least not entirely. The glitter of the thirty years before 1914 has vanished forever and with it the most vainglorious aspects of that ambitious and overexcited era. There remains however the residue of the best aspect of British imperialism—the still precarious growth of ideas of progress, individual liberty, and free institutions in cultures that had never known them before. It can be hoped, we are told, that the imperialist episode will be succeeded by a voluntary association of democratic states strong enough to stand against the new imperialisms that have developed in our own time. If this is to come about re-creations on either side should come to an end, for such an association must still be protected against aggression, a fact taken for granted by the imperialist but until recently ignored by the radical at home and the aspiring democrat abroad. Indeed it is the final irony of the last century that Western political institutions could not have developed in the subject Empire had not their beginnings been safeguarded by a chauvinist imperialism which was usually regarded, and with much truth, as their worst enemy. Whether the initiative of the old imperialism can be utilized in a manner suited to the new situation is the present question. "To discover what kind of imperial idea should inform that initiative, and how it should be applied," concludes Professor Thornton, "remains the cruel test that lies in wait for all British statesmanship in the second half of the twentieth century."

The third volume of the *Cambridge History of the British Empire*, entitled *The Empire-Commonwealth*,² covers with a wealth of scholarly detail most of the period analysed by Professor Thornton. It begins around 1870 and stops immediately after the First World War. It may be a fault in *The Imperial Idea and Its Enemies* that the consideration of the problem is brought up to the present thus requiring examination and judgment of as contentious and recent an incident as the Suez crisis of 1956. On the other hand there is a certain weakness in terminating the Cambridge volumes (this is the last of the series) in 1921. Had the Empire-Commonwealth remained in the form it had taken at that time, or had it disintegrated entirely this plan for the series would have sufficed. However, neither of these eventualities transpired. The Empire-Commonwealth, like the British constitution, appears to be a matter of organic growth and development and the story is not yet finished. A great deal has happened since the Empire delegation signed the Treaty of Versailles. In fact it can be argued that this is precisely the wrong point to stop, since the mood of victory after a great war is an abnormal one in which, under the stimulus of complex emotions, statesmen say and do things which in the cooler atmosphere of normality they must usually reconsider. Nor do all the chapters cover the

²E. A. Benians, James Butler, and C. E. Carrington, eds., *The Cambridge History of the British Empire*. III. *The Empire-Commonwealth 1870-1919*. Cambridge: At the University Press [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1959. Pp. xxii, 948. \$19.50.

whole fifty years. The one concerned with the development of the Imperial Conference begins with the first Colonial Conference in 1887 and terminates in 1914 with the statement, true then, but certainly untrue later, that "the Imperial Conference had become an institution." This is misleading to the student who looks no further. The Imperial Conferences viewed retrospectively accomplished, it must be admitted, very little and with the development of modern communications, it seems not unlikely that they will be abandoned. Even at the height of Chamberlain's crusade they were simply business and political conventions of a high order where the establishment of cordiality among Commonwealth leaders was the only, perhaps the only possible, real order of business. Two of the Conferences, it is true, are of historical importance but these are not dealt with because of the time limitations imposed in the volume. They were the Imperial War Conference of 1917 which became the Imperial War Cabinet; and the Imperial Conference of 1926 to which Lord Balfour presented his report. Since the Commonwealth today is a direct consequence of the decisions taken at London in 1926 it is hard to see why the narrative stopped where it does. Moreover, the Imperial War Cabinet proved not to be the precedent one might surmise it would be from this volume. Twenty-five years later Mackenzie King made it clear that he considered his place to be at Ottawa and not in London. Naturally it is not to be expected that the volume would be carried forward much later than the middle thirties. Since, however, enough had happened between the First World War and the assumption of office by Neville Chamberlain to indicate unequivocally that the Empire-Commonwealth was changing and changing radically some consideration should have been given to these years in a work which is apparently intended to be definitive. The Dominions were moving rapidly towards complete autonomy, at least in theory. Ireland became a republic. India was pressing, ever more urgently, for the fulfilment of promises made to her by the British government in 1917. The weakness of this book is that in it are implicit the assumptions of a generation ago, assumptions which today no longer have much meaning. One is reminded of Sir Alfred Zimmern and Lionel Curtis and the early years of the *Round Table*. This is not to say that the Empire-Commonwealth is in process of dissolution. It is merely to assert, with Professor Thornton, that a new idea of imperialism is necessary if the achievements recorded in the *Cambridge History* are to be preserved and extended.

This limitation applies to the volume as a whole. Some chapters stand very well by themselves. "The Opening of Tropical Africa 1870-1885," "International Rivalry 1885-1895," and "Great Britain and the Powers 1904-1914" are complete essays covering self-contained topics. Others, however, such as "Imperial Defense 1870-1897," "Imperial Defense 1897-1914," "The British Empire and the United States of America 1870-1914," and the aforementioned "Development of the Imperial Conference 1887-1914" are by reason of their subject matter incomplete. These are not isolated episodes in British history. They have to do with parts of a continuing process. To give the impression, in the middle of the twentieth century, that this process is understandable in terms of its stage of development twenty or thirty or more years ago is not very helpful to the contemporary student of the British Empire.

In addition, there is one serious shortcoming in the volume. True to the empirical tradition of British historical writing there is no chapter devoted to the political theory of the Empire and Commonwealth or even to the ideas that inspired it. There certainly was a theory or rather a good many theories and they merit examination if the historical material is to have unity and over-all meaning.

It is not enough to say, as the Vice-Master of Trinity College does in his essay on "Imperial Questions in British Politics 1868-1880" that "by such methods of give and take, of trial and error, and by force of circumstances new conventions and institutions were devised to fit new facts in the relations between self-governing units of the Empire."

This is simply to beg the question. The history of the Empire-Commonwealth may well contain an idea of sovereignty different from and an improvement on the idea of the nation-state which was born in the Renaissance. The possibility is well worth investigation.

These criticisms aside, the *Cambridge History* is as excellent a treatment as can be found of the transitional years between the rise of imperialism and the close of the First World War. The chapters are of a uniformly high order and in the scholarly tradition set by the first two volumes of the series. *The Imperial Idea and Its Enemies* and this volume complement each other. Read together they bring into focus the problems and achievements of Great Britain's overseas expansion in the context of a carefully and thoroughly written historical narrative.

1759

RICHARD A. PRESTON

THE BRITISH VICTORY on the Plains of Abraham not only laid the foundations of modern Canada, it also vitally affected the destinies of Great Britain and the United States. The year 1759 was, therefore, well worthy of special commemoration by historians and six books about the victor and the victory were produced to mark this anniversary. It may be significant that five of these were British, that only one was Canadian, and that none were published in the United States.

The Quebec House Permanent Advisory Committee of which Sir Campbell Stuart, an ex-patriate Canadian, is chairman has published *Wolfe: Portraiture and Genealogy*.¹ This includes first, a Foreword by Sir Campbell which appears to be an anniversary speech made by him on September 13, 1959; second, "The Likeness of Wolfe" by an Assistant Keeper of the National Portrait Gallery, J. F. Kerslake, which is a detailed discussion of the authenticity of all the extant portraits; third, an investigation into Wolfe's ancestry and descendants by the Richmond Herald, Anthony Wagner; and fourth, a "chronology" with historical tables by W. W. Shaw-Zambra, a former secretary of the Wolfe Society. The volume is well illustrated and includes twenty-three Wolfe portraits and one death scene, a little-known one.

For historians, the discussions of the portraits and of the genealogy are valuable reference sources. That there is room for differences of opinion in both spheres is made quite clear; and both writers speak with authority. Unfortunately, in both articles an extremely difficult subject has been made more abstruse than absolutely necessary by lack of clarity in composition. Thus, there is no system of reference from the text to the portraits printed in the book. And both articles should have been worked over more thoroughly by the writers or by an editor.

Sir Campbell Stuart's Foreword dwells upon the traditional theme, that the union of two races was sealed in blood on the field of battle. "From the seeds

¹*Wolfe: Portraiture and Genealogy* (Glasgow University Press for the Quebec House Permanent Advisory Committee, 1959, pp. 111).

of that struggle in our day will come a completely united Canada." If one may judge by the volume of opposition in Quebec to a celebration of the anniversary on the field of battle, this interpretation would seem to be more acceptable to English-speaking Canadians than to those of French blood. The year 1759 was, for most French Canadians, chiefly significant as the year of a French defeat.

An extension of this tradition, deriving in part from the strange coincidence that both generals were killed in the battle, has built an exaggerated idea of their abilities. Aware of this, Sir Campbell Stuart calls for an up-to-date biography of Wolfe now that Beckles Willson's book, which was based on primary research, is fifty years old and Waugh's recapitulation is past its quarter century.

Brian Connell's *The Plains of Abraham*² is the widest of the new books in scope. It deals in about equal proportions with the background of the Seven Years' War, the War itself, the battle at Quebec, and the way in which the victory led to the revolt of the Thirteen Colonies. The author is a journalist who believes that a journalist's mind can be "applied to historical as well as current affairs" with good effect. He has read widely in this field and has incorporated in his book many interesting illustrative quotations and anecdotes which are, however, not documented. His bibliography includes the chief secondary works and published documents and makes vague reference to some archival material. His approach and general interpretation are well-balanced and the end result is a useful, popular narrative with certain limitations which will be dealt with later in this review.

The number of Mr. Connell's errors is small for a non-specialist. Perhaps the most serious is his frequent description of the colonial regular soldiers of France as "colony marines" and of Vaudreuil as a sea captain. More objectionable, at any rate to Loyalist descendants, will be his assertion that during the American Revolution the French Canadians were the most loyal British subjects in North America. And educated French Canadians will not like his description of their language as a *patois*. A map produced as a frontispiece shows *La Présentation* on the north side of the St. Lawrence instead of the south. However, as this is "popular history," Mr. Connell may not also be blamed for repeating long-accepted beliefs now being challenged by other studies. Nor, perhaps, should he be criticized for having produced nothing really new.

Christopher Hibbert's *Wolfe at Quebec*³ devotes less space to the background of the war and its wider political ramifications. As the title suggests, it builds the story around the victor and is in large part a psychological study of a neurotic. Wolfe's personal foibles have not passed without notice hitherto but this author has explored them further and given them a greater emphasis. Mr. Hibbert is an Oxford History Honours graduate who went straight into a distinguished war service career from Oxford. (The book jacket implies that it was at the age of 14!) When peace came he took up auctioneering and real estate for his living, but as a pastime he has written many historical works. He is a facile writer but like many popularizers concentrates on the spectacular rather than on the substance. He obtained some documentary material about military operations from various sources but this is about the limit of his contact with original documents. Even in the sphere in which he shows greatest interest, the personality of his characters, he does not appear to be up with all the latest scholarship. For instance he completely ignores Professor Frégault's theories about

²Brian Connell, *The Plains of Abraham* (London and Toronto: Hodder and Stoughton Limited, 1959, pp. 288, \$4.50).

³Christopher Hibbert, *Wolfe at Quebec* (London and Toronto: Longmans, Green & Company, 1959, pp. xii, 194, \$4.25).

the relative merits of Montcalm and Vaudreuil; but he did know that it was Montcalm, and not Vaudreuil as Wood stated, who said that the English could not climb to the plains because they had no wings. And on the whole his interpretation of Wolfe is reasonable though perhaps a little too clinical.

Christopher Lloyd is an Assistant Professor of History at the Naval College, Greenwich. The bibliography in his *Capture of Quebec*⁴ is much slighter than those in any of the other new books, but he has come closer than any of the works dealt with so far to an investigation of some of the outstanding problems in the events of 1759 and a true evaluation of the general. "Wolfe is not to be compared with great commanders like Marlborough or Wellington, because he never fought war on that scale; but as a master of amphibious operations and as a leader of men there are few to equal him—certainly none in the eighteenth century. Like Nelson, he was frail in body and fearless in action, excitable, even irritable in character, but capable of winning the extremes of love and loyalty in the men he commanded. He was a tactical rather than a strategic genius." Despite his mastery of the general's character, Professor Lloyd's investigation of the campaign and battle, although effective in correcting several erroneous traditions and in giving an acceptable picture of Wolfe's qualities, is disappointingly slight. It forms part of a series of volumes on British battles being produced for popular consumption and lacks real depth.

Robin Reilly's *The Rest to Fortune*⁵ is the only one of this collection of books on 1759 which can claim to be the new biography of Wolfe for which Sir Campbell Stuart hoped. Not as full as Beckles Willson, but containing much more original research than Waugh, it is a straightforward, orthodox account of the life of the hero based on a study of primary sources in Ottawa, Quebec, London, and Edinburgh, as well as on a wide selection of printed documents and secondary works. The narrative is supported by a good many letters which are quoted in full.

The Rest to Fortune deals with Wolfe's early life on a much greater scale than any other of these new books. Reilly has as much evidence of his illnesses as Hibbert and, far from implying that Wolfe was a hypochondriac, states that he was probably tubercular and so gives the general credit for carrying on despite his physical disabilities. Reilly also has more information about Wolfe's personal affairs, especially his amours, and makes him sound quite normal. He gives full evidence of Wolfe's ability as a soldier, especially as a trainer of troops, and also of his studious habits, though in the latter respect he also quotes several of the general's own modest comments about his intellectual capabilities. Reilly is, however, too conservative in the relatively small amount of interpretation which he supplies. He blames Saunders, on circumstantial evidence, for advising Wolfe to make the calamitous attack on Montmorency. And his conclusion that, by the death of Wolfe, Britain lost the only general who could have beaten Washington, is too far-fetched to merit repetition. On Reilly's own showing, tuberculosis would have carried Wolfe off long before 1776; but, in any case, Wolfe was not a success as an army commander and had probably reached his ceiling in 1758.

Although Reilly aimed at supplying background only when necessary to understand some aspects of Wolfe's career, his long accounts of the wars in which

⁴Christopher Lloyd, *The Capture of Quebec* (London: B. T. Batsford Limited [Toronto: British Book Service (Canada) Limited], 1959, pp. 175, illus., \$5.00).

⁵Robin Reilly, *The Rest to Fortune: The Life of Major-General James Wolfe* (London: Cassell & Company Limited [Toronto: British Book Service (Canada) Limited], 1960, pp. xvi, 367, illus., \$7.00).

Wolfe fought as a junior commander seem quite out of proportion by comparison with the space given to the Seven Years' War in which his subject figured so much more prominently. Perhaps it is a result of this distortion that the end of the story sweeps on to a rapid climax carrying the reader along easily but not producing as much new material as the account of Wolfe's early days.

The Canadian work in this collection of studies of the battle of 1759 is likewise a work of real scholarship and original research. Colonel Stacey's *Quebec, 1759*⁶ was the spare time hobby of a soldier-historian who during office hours was writing Canada's military histories. His aim was to retell the story of the battle and its background, to investigate the many myths and legends which have grown up around it, and to attempt a re-appraisal of the military reputations of the participants. Despite its closeness to the source material and its meticulous documentation, it is written in a style which compares not unfavourably with those of the popularizers and journalists. Colonel Stacey does, however, include too many side comments in parentheses, usually for the purpose of giving an authoritative opinion which would have been better relegated to a footnote if not left out altogether. Despite a modest claim that he has no expectation of being definitive where so many of his predecessors have been proved wrong, the book reads rather pontifical at times. But the skill of a master of the craft makes it grip the reader's attention.

Colonel Stacey's method is to pause at any point in the narrative where a fact or opinion, which has been questioned in the past, occurs and to present the evidence from the documents, weigh it, and then give his own considered judgment. Thus he questions statements that have been made about the fortifications at Quebec, saying somewhat brusquely that Archivist Sir Arthur Doughty "seems never to have looked at the documents in his custody with any care;" and he shows that the fortifications in Mackellar's plan, which is usually used to illustrate books on the campaign, had been greatly extended by 1759. Mackellar was aware that his information was old and based on slight knowledge, but Reilly, in *The Rest to Fortune*, assumes that it was accurate. However, the walls on the landward side of the city lacked embrasures for their proper employment. The city was not impregnable against assault from that side, once an attacking army had scaled the cliffs.

As regards the route up the cliffs, Colonel Stacey explored it himself on foot and, contrary to the opinions of Connell, of Reilly, and of Lloyd (the latter two are said to know the area) believes that time has not altered it very much. He scouts the belief that French treachery explained Wolfe's sudden determination to attack at Anse au Foulon, thus contradicting Hibbert who believed, on thin evidence, that Bigot and Cadet were traitors.

Colonel Stacey thinks that Montcalm does not merit the title of a "great captain of history" but praises his refusal to be drawn out of his fortifications to fight with a smaller army. His explanation that the French weakness was inefficiency and corruption in the colony appears to give too little attention to the fundamental flaws in French colonial policy as a whole which led Quebec to an inevitable destiny. On the British side Wolfe's hesitation and inability to decide upon a plan of attack comes in for severe criticism, and the theory that he had never lost sight of his original plan to attack above the city is questioned. (Connell repeats this theory in *The Plains of Abraham* and Reilly also appears to believe it.) Stacey also pours scorn on Waugh's idea (followed by Connell and Reilly) that Wolfe deliberately suggested to his brigadiers various schemes for attack below the city

⁶C. P. Stacey, *Quebec, 1759: The Siege and the Battle* (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1959, pp. xiv, 210, maps, \$5.00).

in order to turn their minds to his own alternative of attack upriver. Like almost all the other authors in this group he gives credit for the selection of Anse au Foulon to the general (Reilly believes Major Stobo may have suggested it); but from his greater experience of writing the history of military operations Colonel Stacey points out, what most of them missed, that Wolfe staked everything on a gamble at long odds that came off. Most of the present writers except Connell have doubts about the famous story that Wolfe read Grey's *Elegy* in the boats as they advanced to the assault, but Colonel Stacey's investigation is much the most thorough. Reilly produces the ingenious theory that the reading took place while the boats lay under the lee of the *Sutherland* waiting to take off. But surely Wolfe wouldn't have had to sit there with his men for several hours. Stacey also expresses an opinion about the tradition that only one volley was fired to win the battle, a theory that Lloyd appears to support, though perhaps inadvertently, and which is given yet greater prestige by no less an authority than the historian of the British Army, Fortescue, but once again in a passage which is ambiguous. Connell speaks of two volleys, Hibbert of ten minutes firing, and Reilly of a "single deafening crash" followed by "a series of deadly volleys." Stacey's own words on the subject are that "in one brief spasm of firing Brown Bess blew Montcalm's army into ruin. The whole desperate encounter lasted only a few short minutes."

One other of Colonel Stacey's many "revisions" must be mentioned, his doubt about the theory that this was a classical amphibious operation in that it was one of a few in which the army and navy co-operated well. He bases this doubt on Wolfe's irritation with the sailors revealed in his letters. But Wolfe was irritable with everybody; and Lloyd's statement that he was a master of amphibious attack is not really contradicted. Reilly recounts the story of disagreements between Wolfe and Saunders but seems to agree that the co-operation was, nevertheless, remarkably good. The whole story of the expedition, and especially of the difficult landing from the boats, seems to disprove Colonel Stacey's low opinion of the effective relations between the general and the sailors.

European

An Introduction to Eighteenth Century France. By JOHN LOUGH. London and Toronto: Longmans, Green & Company. 1960. Pp. 334. \$4.50.

(Reviewed from proofs)

JOHN LOUGH, Professor of French in the University of Durham, has followed up his useful manual, *An Introduction to Seventeenth Century France* (1954), with a companion volume on eighteenth-century France. This book deals at good length with the years 1715-89, which by a quite reasonable convention constitute the eighteenth century in France, and concludes with a kind of coda summarizing in a dozen pages the effects of the French Revolution, 1789-1815. The two books taken together make an "introduction" indeed, but of a very advanced kind. Almost all of the long quotations with which these books are filled are in the original French, helped out it is true with explanatory notes for difficult passages. These are indeed not textbooks of the American kind, but companion volumes for the study of French culture, guides for the exploring mind rather than armchair substitutes for such exploration.

Professor Lough devotes three chapters to an analysis of the class structure of eighteenth-century France and its social and economic history, one on the peasantry, another on the towns and industry, and another on the two privileged orders, clergy and nobility. He then turns in three more chapters to the narrative political history of the regency and the reigns of Louis XV and Louis XVI, with emphasis constantly on the condition of France, the attempts at reforms, and the endemic economic illnesses of the government, all with a minimum of attention to wars and diplomatic history. Finally in two chapters he deals with intellectual history, but by no means in the conventional form of analyses of the systematic thought of the *philosophes* and their opponents. Chapter vii on "The Writer and His Public" and chapter viii on "Literature and Ideas" are the most original in the book, for they explore the way writers earned a living, the way their writings were spread, the way they felt about publishers, censors, their public, and the universe; and they go on to the workings of censorship, the size and literacy of the reading public, and much else of what has to be somewhat heavily called the "sociology of knowledge." (It is unfortunate there is no better term, for the German original from which it is derived, *Wissenssoziologie*, is by no means a happy one.) Throughout, Professor Lough does not hesitate to make useful comparisons with what was going on in eighteenth-century Britain and elsewhere.

The year 1789 reflects back on almost every page, as in this reviewer's opinion it should. Those who protest that a historian ought to be able to write about eighteenth-century France as a kind of thing-in-itself, with no fore or afterthoughts on the great revolution to come, are simply asking for the impossible. Professor Lough is throughout concerned with the question, does this or that help explain 1789—and 1794—and if so, how? His very first chapter on the peasantry is a fine example. He has read Lefebvre, Labrousse, and of course the older materials from Pousseau, Rétif de la Bretonne, Arthur Young, and the rest right on down. He knows what went on in the French countryside in the summer of 1789. Indeed, he asks himself the old question: was this agrarian movement the rising of miserable, oppressed, starving people, or was it the rising of a largely emancipated, land-hungry peasantry pricked by feudal survivals that cramped rather than impoverished them? He points out clearly that conditions among the French peasantry varied enormously by regions, and that the class was in socio-economic terms no uniform one, but ran from poor landless day labourers through a few serfs and many sharecroppers to prosperous landowning farmers. Still, he risks a generalization: the economic indices even in agriculture go on up generally in the eighteenth century, the peasantry as a whole was "better off" than in most of the rest of Europe, yet the 1780's were a time of economic depression, the landlords were putting on a squeeze, and the winter of 1788-9 was a very bad one. Some of the violence of 1789 was inspired by reaction against unbearable physical suffering. This is a sensible conclusion, though it will not satisfy those who want an "either-or" answer to such problems.

So in the rest of the book, Professor Lough tries to arrive at sensible, middle-of-the-road answers to the various social, economic, and intellectual aspects of the master problem: why the French Revolution? He does not attempt to weigh or tabulate the factors he notes, nor does he attempt analogies with other specific problems of causation. He most carefully avoids the temptation to find a single cause, a master cause, a dramatic, emotionally satisfying hero or villain cause. Perhaps, if a modest and not at all rigid dualism can be set up here, he emphasizes rather the failures, the incompetence, the often oppressive rule of those men and institutions and traditions the revolution was directed against rather

than the ambitions, the drives, the chiliastic hopes of those who prepared and directed the revolution. In this he is surely in the tradition of most English-speaking historians of the French eighteenth century and the great French Revolution.

CRANE BRINTON

Harvard University

The Long Way To Freedom. By JAMES T. SHOTWELL. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company Inc. [Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Limited]. 1960. Pp. 639. \$8.25.

IN THIS interpretative analysis of history, which is at the same time a credo and a manifesto, Professor Shotwell reasserts his lifelong conviction in the reality of progress in human affairs, a progress that means more than mere physical and material improvement, that means a betterment of life for a larger and larger portion of humankind, a fuller life for man. At the heart of this progress lies its chief dynamic, freedom of thought. Consequently, history is to be assessed in all societies and at all times by the state of freedom; hence, the title of the book. By taking this stand the author places himself in the long line that stretches from Bayle, Locke, and Voltaire through Jefferson and Condorcet, John Stuart Mill and Thomas Huxley to the present time. It is a tradition that is liberal and rationalist, secular and humanist, and, for the most part, democratic.

If Professor Shotwell belongs to this tradition he is also a man of this generation, or, perhaps one should say, of the passing generation which has been so profoundly shocked by the reversal of its hopes in the ugly disasters of the twentieth century. He belongs to the company of Arnold Toynbee, Bertrand Russell, and Julian Huxley. His re-examination of history to ascertain where men have gone wrong in the past, his deep concern with phenomena like the fall of Rome are characteristic of the shocked generation. His conclusion that the failure to cope with the problems of war and of social oppression were the chief causes of not only the Roman collapse but also of those of other human societies and civilizations is a Toynbeeian note. His assertion that the rise of science is the greatest development in modern history, and that man's main problem today is to adjust to the technological and machine world created by science aligns him with Russell and Huxley. His plea for freedom and for the responsible use of reason, and his strong conviction that man will indeed overcome his current crises and find a way into a new world of unity, co-operation, and fuller life sounds a note of hope that has been little heard for thirty years. And it is hope in the face of an extensive knowledge of cold war and crashing societies for more than a third of the book is given to an analysis of present-day problems. From his long study Professor Shotwell emerges with the final pronouncement, "Civilization is only just beginning to show the glory and nobility of man in a world in which freedom is another name for justice." Clearly, liberalism is not dead.

RICHARD M. SAUNDERS

University of Toronto

A History of Modern Germany: The Reformation. By HAJO HOLBORN. New York: Alfred A. Knopf [Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Limited]. 1959. Pp. xviii, 374, xxi. \$8.75 (trade), \$6.50 (text).

Hajo Holborn of Yale is the outstanding authority teaching and writing German history in America today. That fact, plus the sorely felt need for a comprehensive historical survey of Germany, in English, makes such a work by him an event

of undeniable importance. A translation of the collaborative volume, *Deutsche Geschichte im Überblick*, edited by Peter Rassow (Stuttgart, 1953), would still be welcome; but Holborn has now given us the first of two volumes which will, in combination, constitute a fuller and in many respects more penetrating study than the Rassow "handbook" pretends to be.

Although this first volume treats the history of Germany from the emergence of the tribal duchies down to 1648, its subtitle, "The Reformation," is none the less appropriate. For Professor Holborn spends only thirty-seven pages of part I on the period before 1500, then settles down to discuss political, economic, and religious life in the sixteenth century. Part II is wholly devoted to Protestantism, part III to the Catholic Reformation and the Thirty Years' War. This last section terminates with a treatment of the Peace of Westphalia in terms of both its roots in the past and its implications for the ensuing centuries.

It would be impossible to conceive of so ambitious an undertaking's meeting perfectly all the demands which can be placed upon it. At the most elementary level, there are numerous small editorial lapses which should be weeded out of any future edition. A slightly more substantial objection might be raised against repetitions in the discussion of social and economic changes, repetitions which suggest that certain phenomena—unexpected price slumps, for example—appeared recurrently in the same form, but each time seemingly afresh, in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries. Finally, and most serious, a general text, devoid of footnotes, is a difficult and sometimes quite unsatisfying medium through which to follow Professor Holborn's provocative sorties onto various battlefields of specialized interpretation.

Let no one conclude, however, that such reservations cancel the pleasures of this volume. Into it there are set a number of brilliant little essays, such as the one on "Effects of the Black Death" (pp. 56-7), which deserve to be read and reread with the utmost care. There is a magnificent treatment of Luther, critical yet sympathetic, a veritable synthesis of the best that has been written on the reformer's life, yet controlled throughout by Holborn's own powerful analysis. Best of all, there is a striking range of perspective, an understanding of how things looked from North and South, East and West German points of view—the more remarkable for the author's introductory self-placement in the Prussian tradition of Meinecke, Hintze, and Harnack. It is this all-German breadth of approach that augurs best for Professor Holborn's still more difficult task, the completion of his second volume. In that volume, from 1648 to the present, the differing German angles of vision will presumably all be employed for a fuller understanding of the emergence and destiny of the modern German nation-state.

FRANKLIN L. FORD

Harvard University

War in the Modern World. By THEODORE ROPP. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press. 1959. Pp. xvi, 400. \$10.00.

THE PRESENT WORK, highly compressed and well-documented, surveys the history of land and sea warfare in Europe and the United States from the fifteenth century to the present. The first section, "The Age of the Great Captains," closes with Napoleon I. The second considers the impact of the Industrial Revolution on warfare to 1914. The third, entitled "The Age of Violence," deals with the two World Wars and the variations in temperature of the Cold War. This conventional periodization enables the author to fit the military narrative conveniently into the framework of general history. The method, reminiscent of

Delbrück, is most effective, but on occasion it has led the author to overlook the impact of war on domestic policies and institutions. Universal conscription and the rise of the mass army in nineteenth-century Europe increased the pressure on Continental governments to make political or economic concessions to the lower orders to strengthen their loyalty. If the concessions were generally regarded as inadequate, the position of the government became precarious. The fate of the Romanov and Habsburg dynasties in 1917-18 illustrates the degree to which the efforts of conservative régimes to augment their military power by general conscription might under critical conditions hasten the downfall of the dynasty itself. Again, the triumphs of the Prussian armies in 1866 and 1870 reacted powerfully on the constitutional evolution of Prussia by diminishing the prestige and self-confidence of the Liberal opposition to Bismarck. In an earlier period, the expansion and consolidation of Lutheranism in Germany was facilitated in part by the offensive of the Ottoman Turks against the hereditary domains of the Habsburgs, who delayed drastic action against Lutheranism partly in the hope of mobilizing German military support against the Turks.

Limitations of space have compelled the author to omit some important and attractive topics. Institutions of military education receive no mention. The transplantation of skilled personnel and military techniques from the European to the non-European world, a process which ultimately produced radical changes in the military balance of the continents, is passed over. Similarly, the author has been obliged to exclude a discussion of the evolution of Soviet military doctrine after the publication of General Talenskii's revisionist views in 1953. In another much debated field, the Schlieffen Plan of 1905-6, the author tends to accept the adverse verdicts of Edmonds, Liddell Hart, and Ritter (pp. 205-11). But Schlieffen was correct in the assumption that Germany must win the forthcoming war early, or sink slowly in defeat. His intractable problem, which he fully appreciated, was that his country could not exert in the West the superiority of manpower and *matériel* necessary to ensure a reasonable prospect of success for a massive initial offensive.

The bibliography is admirable, and only a few supplemental items require mention here. They include two studies by E. Silberman, *La Guerre dans la pensée économique du XVI^e au XVIII^e siècles* (Paris, 1939), and *The Problem of War in 19th Century Economic Thought*, translated by A. H. Krappe (Princeton, 1946), Stanislaw Andrzejewski, *Military Organization and Society* (London, 1954), B. Brodie, *Strategy in the Missile Age* (Princeton, 1959), and H. S. Dinerstein, *War and the Soviet Union* (New York, 1959). In sum, the present work is a first-rate survey which meets the requirements of scholarship with outstanding success and unfailingly fixes the attention of the reader.

C. C. BAYLEY

McGill University

The Memoirs of the Rt. Hon. Sir Anthony Eden: Full Circle. By ANTHONY EDEN. London: Cassell & Company Limited [Toronto: British Book Service (Canada) Limited]. 1960. Pp. xviii, 619. \$7.50.

EDMUND BURKE once remarked that if he knew what a man was reading and whom he had met in youth, he could tell you what that man was like now. This has some point when applied to the career of Sir Anthony Eden, whose context of thought and emotion about politics was set firm during his early career as Minister for League of Nations Affairs and as Foreign Secretary during the 1930's. Indeed, he underlines the point himself in calling his reminiscences *Full*

Circle—which is, when examined, a curious metaphor to use to describe a progressive career. In fact, the political wheel had turned farther than Sir Anthony was, or is now, aware of: and it is this element of incomprehension that supplies the note of sadness that inevitably runs through his book.

It is already a famous account, and has been dissected by amateurs and professionals alike. Certainly it will always be used by historians, who will also, it is to be hoped, be using at the same time other accounts of this period written from a less personal slant. Yet this expression of personality is essential not only to the form of the book, but also to any understanding of this celebrated and "circular" career. In the 1930's Eden's judgment of the way the world was going was correct, and the loss of his office not only signally increased his confidence in his own prescience, but brought him the support of a wide international opinion. Again, in the early 1950's his very remarkable diplomatic talents were of profound service to a troubled Europe, at a time when the leadership from Washington lacked often both vision and common sense. Unfortunately these diplomatic and personal successes—best exemplified here in the description of the Geneva settlement of 1954—led Eden to equate the prestige of his own abilities with the strength of Great Britain's position as a whole, led him to believe that, since the singleminded pursuit of British interests was so self-evidently in the interest of the entire Western world, any unilateral step taken by Britain would inevitably command the approval of all her friends and allies. In the Middle East he continued to apply that kind of diplomacy that Britain had, since 1919, used in the area (the area itself may be said to have been invented by British strategists). This diplomacy was a power-diplomacy—a power not wantonly to be asserted, but certainly to be used in emergency. The use of force was at once considered in Cabinet, Eden tells us, when Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal in July, 1956. If it was not employed that was only because it was not, at that time, available. When it was available, after four exasperating months had passed, it was employed. The series of international diplomatic explosions that at once took place caught Eden entirely by surprise and ended his political career.

He remarks that he has never felt that he has forfeited the nation's confidence, and that, at every important point in his public career, he has had a better public than press. He is right on both counts. Much in "Suez 1956" appealed to nostalgic emotions in the British public, to the feeling that it was "a good thing" to take Nasser's measure by asserting British power in a vital area in the good old-fashioned style. Probably much of Eden's feeling against Nasser, which has not diminished, was personal, as he felt that the latter had reneged on the Canal Zone Agreement (when Britain evacuated) of 1954. Moreover, much of his positive action was based on the wish to appear "a strong Prime Minister," at a time when he was both physically unwell and being subjected to a campaign of denigration in the press, most of it inspired by members of his own party. No doubt he had the defects of his qualities—a tendency to fuss, to oversee, to override. Yet Eden stands in popular estimation as a man of courage and sincerity, doing what he thought to be right.

Why he thought it right in the first place remains a secret he does not himself tell, though he is often on the verge of it (see his letter to Eisenhower, pp. 464-5). It is the business of a national statesman to put the interests of his own country first. In this era of internationalism and mutual danger, there is an extremely difficult balance to strike. That Eden could not, in the upshot, manage to strike it is itself a measure of the magnitude of the problem, for here was a man who knew the international scene and the figures upon it like no other statesman

of his time—yet he deduced incorrectly from the facts as presented. One has heard Lord Attlee's cold comment, "great talents but no judgment." It is not the whole of the truth. Eden's autobiography is itself true so far as it goes, but he awaits a biographer who will know more, and feel less, than he.

A. P. THORNTON

University College of the West Indies
Jamaica

The Spare Chancellor: The Life of Walter Bagehot. By ALASTAIR BUCHAN. London: Chatto and Windus [Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Company, Limited]. 1959. Pp. 287. \$5.50.

I HAVE FOR SOME TIME been distressed and puzzled by the discovery that students, either graduate or undergraduate, take poorly to Bagehot. They seem indifferent to his style, unimpressed by his wit, and hostile to his irony. Have they lost their literary sense—or have they failed to acquire one—in that grey torrent of words, written and spoken, usually by doctors of philosophy, to which they have been mercilessly exposed from a tender age? Or can they not forgive Bagehot for his outspoken dislike of equality and his equally outspoken criticism of congressional government? I should be saddened to think that my experience is a general one.

It is therefore a comfort to find a book about Bagehot which is plainly the work of an admirer. Mr. Buchan subscribes fully to G. M. Young's judgment of Bagehot: "*Victorianorum maximus*, no. But *Victorianum maxime* I still aver him to be." Indeed, if I understand Buchan correctly, he finds grounds for admiring Bagehot which even G. M. Young failed to find: namely Bagehot's habit of realistic social analysis and his innovations in prose style. If this does G. M. Young less than justice, it nevertheless makes plain that Buchan's heart is in the right place.

Unfortunately his enthusiasm has not carried him triumphantly over all of his obstacles. There was, first, a dearth of biographical material: Bagehot's sister-in-law, Mrs. Barrington, who wrote the *Life* in her collected edition, destroyed many of the family papers; and the Germans destroyed the original files of the *Economist* which Bagehot edited from 1859 to 1877. Mr. Buchan therefore has little new to tell of Bagehot's life—although I am both surprised and pleased to find that, contrary to learned advice of English friends, I have been pronouncing his name correctly. It is Badgeott with the accent on the first syllable—and not Bagot. Second, there was also that capacity in Bagehot (as G. M. Young said) to throw about ideas "as lustily as a giant baby playing skittles." Whoever sets out to portray Bagehot's mind should have something more of his capacity than Mr. Buchan displays. Admittedly he provides a most useful summary of Bagehot's chief works; but Bagehot cut and dried is less than one might expect from a Bagehot enthusiast.

DAVID SPRING

Johns Hopkins University

Das Münchener Abkommen von 1938. By BORIS CELOVSKY. Quellen und Darstellungen zur Zeitgeschichte, III. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt. 1958. Pp. 518.

MUNICH WAS the most celebrated, and certainly the most important, diplomatic crisis of the inter-war years. Perhaps, as Boris Celovsky suggests, it marked the end of one era, the beginning of another. The occupation of Prague in the spring

of 1939 followed logically and naturally, and, though few could discern it in September 1938, "peace for our time" led inevitably to war, and war to the supersession of the European states system by a division of the continent into two ideological and political camps whose power bases lay outside its geographical limits. The four-power conference in the Bavarian capital provided a fearful Europe with a brief and joyful escape from the ominously real shadow of a general war. Subsequently the two words—Munich and appeasement—became synonymous. So powerful has been this legacy that in the 1950's negotiation came to mean treason. Indeed, as his recently published memoirs show, Anthony Eden was mesmerized by the lessons of Munich, misapplied, into the final tragedy which wrecked his own career and dealt British prestige a cruel blow.

A great deal of the inside story of the Munich crisis was already known when John W. Wheeler-Bennett published his dramatic *Munich: Prologue to Tragedy* in 1948. And R. G. D. Laffan's more sober *The Crisis over Czechoslovakia, January to September, 1938* (London, 1951), the most recent detailed account in English, was able to make use of the first two volumes of the 1937-45 series of documents from the captured German Foreign Office archives. The whole of the vast range of official and private material now available, as well as a number of personal testimonies from Czech and German participants, was used in this large and detailed German account, *Das Münchener Abkommen von 1938*. For Celovsky, the destruction of his native Czechoslovakia was *erlebte Weltgeschichte*. As a schoolboy in Oderberg on the Silesian frontier, he witnessed the arrival of the Poles early in October, 1938; five months later he saw the SS march into the rump of the Czech state. It is of especial interest that his book, the work of a Czech, and written inevitably from a Czech point of view, was sponsored for publication by the Munich Institut für Zeitgeschichte as an important contribution to the study of a critical problem of the National Socialist epoch.

Celovsky's book opens with a brief but skilfully drawn portrait of the two decades after the emergence of Czechoslovakia in 1918, and an analysis of Hitler's use of the formula of self-determination as a weapon in an expansionist foreign policy. He then proceeds to a detailed account of the crisis from the *Anschluss* to the Munich Conference. Always looking outward from Prague, his method is first to analyse at each stage the position of Czechoslovakia, and then to survey the policies of Hitler's Reich and the western powers. Inevitably his judgement of Neville Chamberlain is a harsh one. He sees Chamberlain's appeasement as essentially directed towards achieving an understanding with Hitler in the face of the re-emergence of Bolshevik power in western Europe. Perhaps, as Paul Kluge comments in his introduction, this judgement is too severe, and there is more to be said of Chamberlain's concern to make whatever sacrifice would avert war and to unite English-speaking opinion against Hitler.

Celovsky's book will undoubtedly remain a standard work for some time to come. Its chief merits are the scope and scale of the analysis, the sober and balanced treatment, the clear organization, and the enormous amount of material on which it is based. It does not, indeed it could not, add much that is new. A definitive work on so recent a crisis must await the publication of documents from the Italian and Soviet archives, and of memoirs such as Eden's. Moreover, it will be surprising if Celovsky is not challenged by a German work which attempts to set the 1938 crisis in the longer-range perspective of Czech-German relations, rather than in terms of the relations of the nation states in Central Europe, and the working out of Wilsonian ideas as corrupted by Hitler.

R. A. SPENCER

University of Toronto

North American

Movements of Political Protest in Canada, 1640-1840. By S. D. CLARK. Social Credit in Alberta, Its Background and Development, 9. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1959. Pp. x, 518. \$6.50.

WITH THE APPEARANCE of J. A. Irving's *Social Credit in Alberta* and of this volume, Professor Clark brings his task of general editor of the Social Credit series to a close. The initiation and supervision of these ten volumes, coupled with the writing of the one under review, was a major enterprise, and in carrying it out Professor Clark placed all students of Canadian history and politics in his debt, not least those who wrote the other volumes of the series.

His own book is a major work of analysis and revision. It is written as a thesis and, it is perhaps fair to infer, as a challenge to other interpretations of Canadian historians. The thesis should be read in his own words in the Introduction, but may be indicated here by quotation: "we have tended," Dr. Clark writes, "to dismiss our rebels of the past as misguided individuals out of accord with their fellow Canadians and to fall back on the easy explanation, in accounting for the fact that we have been free of the kind of disturbances characteristic of American political society, that an entirely different set of forces have shaped the development of political institutions in this country than in the United States." "What this study seeks to demonstrate," he continues, after explaining that American government, as Turner emphasized, grew out of the frontier experience of the American people, "is that Canada shared in this frontier experience and that, as a consequence, any explanation of Canadian political development must take this fact into account." It follows from this that Canadian political institutions, not being a result of the frontier experience, are in fact the result of the effort made to hold the results of that experience in check. For example, Dr. Clark writes: "Responsible government developed in reaction rather than in response to the true democratic spirit of the Canadian people."

Thus early, on pages three and four of his Introduction, does Dr. Clark make his thesis abundantly clear. Canada, like the United States, underwent the frontier experience, in which the true democratic spirit was engendered. Canada accordingly shared the frontier phase and its products, the revolutionary movement and agrarian democracy of American history. In Canada, however, these things did not produce the results they did in the United States, revolution, early independence, isolation, and republican institutions. They were thwarted by the imperial connection with France and Great Britain, the monopolistic controls of the "empire of the St. Lawrence," and the concomitant loyalism and reaction. In consequence, all political protest movements down to 1840 were suppressed or contained.

Dr. Clark commits himself, then, to an application of the frontier thesis to two centuries of Canadian history. As the thesis tends to emphasize environment rather than institutions, and to be deterministic rather than contingent, Dr. Clark is using a blunt instrument to perform a delicate operation. In practice, the thesis too often becomes a curious combination of dogmatism and loose generalization, faults which mar the early portions of this work. In the opinion of this reviewer, the frontier in the American sense was not typical, but atypical of Canadian development, and to use the thesis as an American historian might do is impossible for a Canadian.

Moreover, in that part of his book which carries the study down to 1815, this reviewer feels that Dr. Clark was experimenting in method. He was attempting, it

seems, to combine historical with sociological method. He is not always successful. The reason, one suspects, is that while the historical use of evidence does lead to tentative generalization, sociological method necessarily leads to an attempt at positive and comprehensive generalization. The two methods are not easily made compatible, and the attempt to combine them leads Dr. Clark into questionable statements, such as that on page eight in which the Seven Years' War is grouped with those of 1775, 1812-14, and the border raids of 1837 as a frontier "war of liberation," or such as that on page 88 where the Montreal merchant of 1775 in welcoming the continental army was only playing the American frontiersman's historical role of "supporting any movement against the outside control of the approaches to the American continental interior." Is it being hypercritical to suggest that a method which sees as a frontiersman a merchant resident in a town one hundred and thirty-three years old leaves something to be desired as an instrument of analysis?

It is true that the attempt often leads to penetrating insights, as it did in the hands of the late H. A. Innis, and as it does in Dr. Clark's. For instance, he wins admiring assent from this reviewer when he writes on page fifty that "what the English colonists were anxious to secure in 1775 was a united rather than an independent America," or of the reaction in the United States after the revolution: "In the period 1778-93 there was in effect no American frontier," and then goes on to indicate how indirectly but surely Jay's Treaty, by removing British opposition to the advance of the frontier, led to the War of 1812.

Such results are achieved intermittently, however, and the effect of the generalization often derives, not from a summing up of evidence, but by deduction from previous assertions. The book actually contains much sounder and more valuable work, particularly in chapter vi, "The New Loyalist Provinces," chapter viii, "Nova Scotia," and chapter ix, "New Brunswick." Here Dr. Clark is working directly from his sources and writes a straight narrative. The frontier thesis and the need to generalize are largely forgotten, and a distinct and original contribution is made to Canadian historical knowledge. The same observations are true of the last section of five chapters on "The Canadian Rebellions, 1815-1840." Dr. Clark adds greatly to our information and understanding of the purposes, methods, and above all, the organization of the reform movements and rebellions in the Canadas. He does not, it is true, take account of the economic background, particularly the collapse of wheat farming in the Montreal and Richelieu districts. He does demonstrate how widespread discontent was in both provinces, but he then explains why discontent so widespread should have been so easily suppressed with a reluctance that does not square with his manifest grasp of the evidence. The fact, seems to be that, after a masterly description of radical activity, Dr. Clark reverts to his thesis and tries to force his evidence into the framework of the frontier thesis, American democracy, and American continentalism. These were undoubted factors in the whole story. But western Lower Canada was not a frontier in 1837, as it had been settled for over a century. It was a cropped-out wheatland, whose people were on the verge of enforced migration to new lands and the New England mills. Upper Canadian radicals were as much British or Irish as American, and perhaps as much urban as agrarian. (If Canada is to have its Turner, ought it not to have its Schlesinger also?) And there was really nothing done in Upper Canada in 1837 that the Chartists were not to attempt in Great Britain two years later. Indeed, the whole British background of institutions and radical movements is at least as pertinent as American example in the agitation from 1827 to 1837. The liberation aspects of the rebellions were of course simply another

instance of the fact that the United States in its early years was something of an international conspiracy against the security and government of other states.

While Dr. Clark's methodology is sometimes awkward and not always fruitful, it must be said in conclusion that he has worked impressively on big issues arising from the nature and development of Canadian political society. To an understanding of these issues he has contributed many new insights and much new information. His work is challenging, and masterly in its kind.

Of its place in Canadian historiography it is perhaps to be said that it shares a fault common to all recent Canadian historical work, the projection into the colonial past of a very recent national sentiment. It is doubtful whether before 1867 there was much but force and interest to decide the course of what became Canadian history. Even the Loyalists were not twentieth-century Canadians. This is why our politics could be so largely what this reviewer would call "continental" and Dr. Clark calls "frontier" down to as late as 1891. Until that year Canadian radicals could without feeling disloyal contemplate union with the United States. After that decisive repudiation of continentalism in the year the American frontier closed, be it noted, a common national sentiment did grow up in Canada which became the possession of all political opinions. It ought not, however, to be allowed now to colour the interpretation of a colonial past in which the imperial policy and the economics of staple trades and continental distances were working blindly to leave a deposit of people which under attack by an aggressive neighbour and the discipline of a great commercial system grew into a nation.

It follows that any connection between the protest movements Dr. Clark has studied and those of this century must be slight. The Progressive and Social Credit movements took place in a national context, the limits of which were rarely fundamentally questioned.

W. L. MORTON

University of Manitoba

The Papers of Henry Clay. I. The Rising Statesman, 1797-1814. Edited by JAMES F. HOPKINS and MARY W. M. HARGREAVES. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press. 1959. Pp. xvi, 1037. \$15.00.

THE PUBLICATION of the first volume of *The Papers of Henry Clay* is part of an important trend in historical circles in the United States during the past decade—that of publishing new editions of the writings of major political figures. The fruits of this trend have already been notable: in 1950 the first volume of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* appeared, and by the end of 1959 the fifteenth volume of those *Papers* had been published, with thirty-five more in prospect; during the years 1953-5 were published the nine volumes of *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*; the year 1959 saw the publication not only of the first volume, of a proposed ten, of *The Papers of Henry Clay*, but also the first volume, of a proposed fifteen, of *The Papers of John C. Calhoun*, and the first volume, of a proposed forty, of *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*. The year 1960, it is estimated, will witness the appearance both of the first volume of the papers of James Madison and also the opening four volumes of the papers of the Adams family. Even then, the limits of this scholarly publishing trend will not have been marked out, for plans are said to be underway for publishing the papers of Alexander Hamilton, Daniel Webster, James K. Polk, Stephen A. Douglas, Andrew Johnson, and Woodrow Wilson. Thus, the publication of the first volume of *The Papers of Henry Clay* is part of a harvest of scholarly effort with prospects for a continuing harvest, which is both impressive and pleasant to contemplate.

The question naturally arises as to how these new editions compare with the older editions. Is there enough of an improvement to justify the time, expense, and energy which are required in this vast publishing effort? If we consider the first volume of *The Papers of Henry Clay*, the judgment of this reviewer is that this volume constitutes a noteworthy advance over previous editions of Clay's writings in at least two respects. In the first place, this volume makes available much more material than had been collected and printed in convenient form previously. The meaning of this statement can be seen partly in terms of sheer bulk. The standard edition of Clay's writings for the past half-century has been *The Works of Henry Clay*, published in ten volumes in 1904 (the 1904 edition was virtually the same as a seven-volume edition published in 1897, and as a six-volume edition published in 1857). In the 1904 edition, the writings by and to Clay through the year 1814 fill only 100 pages, whereas in the new one 1,013 pages of the writings during that period are printed. Not only does the book contain approximately ten times as much material pertaining to Clay, but it also includes a greater variety of material than did the 1904 edition whose scope was limited almost completely to the two main categories of "private correspondence" and "speeches." But the 1959 volume contains, in addition to those two categories, newspaper articles and notices by Clay, legislative proposals and diplomatic papers by him, memoranda of court actions and summaries of property deeds, and a wide variety of personal business papers (bills, receipts, promissory notes, bonds, mortgage deeds, bills of sale, rental agreements). These new types of material provide glimpses of various facets of Clay's life—through the receipted bills, for example, one can estimate the extent and some of the cost of Clay's liking for wine, "segars," and betting on horses.

This volume marks a tremendous advance, in the second place, over previous editions of Clay's writings due to its excellent editing. The annotations in the 1959 volume are numerous and full, unlike the 1904 edition. Comparison of the two editions reveals that in the 1904 edition there are omissions of portions of letters which are not indicated, there are omissions of portions of letters which are indicated but not explained, and there are letters which are not dated or for which the addressee is not given. These defects are remedied in the 1959 volume. One characteristic of the editing may seem a trifle peculiar to persons unfamiliar with the Kentucky climate of opinion: the editor includes in the index the "names of people, organizations, blooded livestock, estates, taverns, and watering places." Thus, while one searches the index in vain for the name "Canada" or the names of other countries, he will find there the names of "Eagle Tavern," "Foster's Tavern," plus a veritable stable of horses of the blood from "Adventurer" to "Woodpecker." The name of one horse, "Buzzard," carries seven entries in the index, which happens to be the same number of entries carried by the name "John C. Calhoun." Perhaps that is the way Clay would have wanted it.

To many scholars, the most interesting and valuable portion of this volume may prove to be the large section devoted to the years from 1811 through 1814 when Clay was Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and, in 1814, a member of the commission which negotiated peace between the United States and England. Whatever the scholar's particular interest, however, he will find this admirable volume a mine of information concerning Henry Clay, concerning the life of a young lawyer-politician in the United States of the early nineteenth century, and concerning life in the near-frontier town of Lexington, Kentucky.

THOMAS J. PRESSLY

University of Washington
Seattle

The Papers of Benjamin Franklin. I. January 6, 1706 through December 31, 1734.
 Edited by LEONARD W. LABAREE, WHITFIELD J. BELL, JR., HELEN C. BOATMAN,
 and HELENE H. FINEMAN. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1959. Pp.
 lxxxviii, 400. \$7.50.

IT IS HARD to know what to praise most in this first of a projected forty volumes of Franklin papers. That it is the beginning of what will be by far the most complete edition of Franklin documents ever published, the most thoroughly and carefully edited, and the most elegantly produced is obvious from a glance. The editor, Professor Leonard W. Labaree of Yale, and the associate editor, Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., have taken full advantage of the resources placed at their disposal by the sponsors, *Life* magazine, the American Philosophical Society, and Yale University. They have scoured the libraries and private collections of the United States and of other countries for new materials; they have tracked down every reference in the documents; and they have worked into their editorial commentary the entire literature that has grown up around their extraordinary subject. They have solved innumerable problems of selection, and present a work of exhaustive scholarship modestly and with taste.

So far, in fact, does this edition promise to supersede all previous publications of Franklin's writings or works that one is left after reading these 383 elegant pages of documents covering the first twenty-eight years of Franklin's life (the most thinly documented period of his career) with the feeling that this enterprise is somehow different in kind from previous editions. The editors' purpose and interests are different from those of Duane, Sparks, Bigelow, and Smythe, and their product is of a different genre.

The difference appears at the very beginning, in the Introduction, which contains not only a detailed publication history of the Franklin papers and a description of the elaborate and meticulous system of selection and presentation the present editors have used, but also a twenty-nine-page genealogy of the Franklin family including ten pages of charts—without doubt the most complete such reconstruction ever made. The difference comes out even more clearly in the kinds of materials the editors include. This edition, they write in the Introduction, will contain not only "the full text of every document . . . that we can locate and establish to our satisfaction to have been written by Franklin or by Franklin with others," but also "letters and other communications, personal or official, addressed to Franklin individually, or to an official body of which he was a member" and in addition a selection of "third party" letters, which were sent to Franklin for his information or action." But even this much is not sufficient for the comprehensiveness the editors seek. Among the manuscripts are also volumes of "miscellaneous business papers, invoices, bills of exchange, and calling cards" as well as legal papers and official records like those of Franklin's postmastership. All such items could not reasonably be published even in as complete an edition as this; but the editors promise at least a description and location of each such document and, when warranted, samples and abstracts.

They are as good as their word. Their solution to the main difficulty of editing this first volume—how to present Franklin's work as printer, especially his early newspaper writing—is to publish as separate essays all articles which by style or by other evidence they can confidently identify as Franklin's; to list and discuss the question of authorship of those they are not sure of or that have elsewhere been wrongly ascribed to Franklin; and to place after the entries for each calendar year a section entitled "Extracts from the *Gazette*" containing selections from "the local news, reports, advertisements, squibs, and announcements" Frank-

lin printed in the *Gazette* for that year, the purpose being "to illustrate the variety of these materials" which "show Franklin, his family and friends, and the people and events which reflected or excited his interests." And *Poor Richard's Almanak*, which appeared annually starting in 1733, though it followed quite stereotyped eighteenth-century patterns, is reproduced photographically in its entirety in the present volume, and certain sections of it—"Franklin's addresses to the reader, the verses and aphorisms of each month, some of the explanations, descriptions, and miscellaneous verses"—are printed in addition, this excerpting procedure to be followed for the subsequent editions of the almanac.

Most distinctive of all, however, and most revealing of the editors' interests and purpose, is the editorial commentary. That the editors describe in footnotes all textual variants and explain all references to people and events in the documents comes as no surprise, though the thoroughness of their detective work in tracing the literary sources and the models Franklin used is remarkable. But their separate introductions to the major papers—the Dogood essays, the *Dissertation on Liberty and Necessity*, the *Enquiry into . . . Paper-Currency*—are of a different order. The aim of these sections is not so much to explain obscurities of text but to make clear the historical context in which the documents were written and their place in the development of Franklin's career. The focus shifts, in other words, from a document to a person and a historical situation. At times in these passages it seems as if the whole procedure of editing has quietly been transformed, from the use of historical knowledge to explain a text to the use of a text to explain a man and his times. Ultimately, of course, both purposes are served by an edition of this sort, and what it comes down to is perhaps only a shift in emphasis; but it is an important shift. For unlike their predecessors who had in common a primary devotion either to Franklin's memory or to the process of collecting and publishing the documents of the great, the present editors are first and foremost historians trained and habituated to search for an understanding of the past, of the significant developments in the affairs of men. In the last analysis it is this instinct and purpose that shapes their editorial work and that promises to make of the whole series not merely an excellent edition of papers but an important addition to our knowledge of eighteenth-century history.

BERNARD BAILYN

Harvard University

Church and State in Canadian Education: An Historical Study. By C. B. Sissons. Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1959. Pp. x, 414. \$6.50.

AS READERS of Dr. Charles E. Phillips's excellent book, *The Development of Education in Canada* (Toronto, 1957), are aware, the historian who attempts to survey the whole Canadian educational picture is faced with the monumental task of presenting the history of each province. It is a complex story everywhere, and its teller must be a man who has done intensive research over a period of many years, and at the same time has first-hand knowledge of the workings of educational systems. Phillips's book represents a major achievement in Canadian historiography; much monographic work will have to be done before the need will arise for a new synthesis. While at first glance it might seem that Professor Sisson's study is much more limited in scope, he has grappled with the most difficult issue of all and his book will stand in its own right as an important accomplishment.

The author is especially well-equipped to handle this vexing question. His early interest in the bilingual dispute and his absorption in the life of Rev. Egerton Ryerson, the founder of Ontario's school system, have given him a thorough know-

ledge of the most varied aspects of the problem. Although he is the professor emeritus of ancient history at Victoria College, his passion for Canadian history has been of long standing and fruitful in result. Since the question of the relationship between church and state in education is a continuing one, and one that has not been at all adequately explored in any province, *Church and State in Canadian Education* is not so much a definitive history as an outline of legislation, court decisions, and current practices. Through the use of manuscript and newspaper sources, some new information has been offered, but much of the political background is absent. This is understandable in view of the vast amount of untapped material available. Not only is it beyond the capacity of the individual historian, but it is too extensive to be surveyed in any one volume.

The publishers feature on the cover Sissons's statement from his Preface that he questioned a tendency in Canada which he believed to be "wrong and divisive, even disruptive." This tendency was the treatment of the educational privileges of the Roman Catholic Church as a basic constitutional right, whereas the founding fathers had in mind not the Church as a group, but the conscientious convictions of individuals. This is a feature of the book, but at the same time there is little that is tendentious. Sissons writes objectively, without rancour and with kindness to all religious groups. While he dislikes the principle of separate schools, their supporters will find much to welcome, as for example his remarks on corporation taxes and the three-mile limit in Ontario. Graduates of St. Michael's College will be especially pleased with his several friendly references to the Congregation of Saint Basil.

This reviewer would question, however, some of his judgments concerning the school question in Upper Canada. Sissons, while offering new evidence and careful analyses of decisive points, adheres to the general view of Ryerson and his disciple Hodgins. One of Ryerson's arguments was that the agitation in the 1850's arose because of a new "ultramontane" tendency on the part of the Ontario bishops which was foreign to the Catholic mind of the earlier generation. Now the evidence is scanty to prove or disprove this point, but in my opinion after going through Catholic newspapers and the letters of the early bishops it is not sound. Certainly what is required is a serious study on the nature of so-called Canadian ultramontaniam. The author's citations from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* are not adequate for such a delicate and important discussion.

One of the many merits of the book is to show that in every province, save possibly British Columbia, the Catholic attitude to education was a serious and lasting problem for educators, politicians, and citizens in general. All in all, this is a painstaking work, which should stimulate further scholarship to help achieve that understanding to which the author has for so long contributed.

FRANKLIN A. WALKER

Loyola University
Chicago

Our Living Tradition, Second and Third Series. Edited by ROBERT L. McDOUGALL.
Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1959. Pp. xvi, 288. \$6.50.

THIS VOLUME, containing the second and third series of Carleton lectures, suggests two conclusions: that our only recognizable traditions are political traditions, and that only Canadian historians really believe that our traditions are still alive. J. M. S. Careless and David Farr discuss George Brown and John Ewart with a well-founded assurance that they understand their man and his political setting and so they can confidently assess his achievements and suggest the moral—Brown

as an "undoubted sectionalist but national architect as well," and Ewart as a doctrinaire and so "of necessity a poor politician." Both essays bear the burden of careful research with poise and purpose. James Gibson is content to discuss Sir Robert Borden's contributions to Canadian autonomy without assessing his domestic policies, but again it is done with assurance. Jean Bruchési's lecture on Louis Joseph Papineau is a surprising exception to the rule, for in French Canada traditions are very much alive and Papineau is almost a traditional symbol. Bruchési, however, has concentrated on the exiled Papineau's correspondence with his wife and has suggested facets of a personality rather than a tradition.

There is less assurance about our cultural traditions, possibly because the tender plant is regularly drowned by new European or American tidal waves. Robert McDougall uses Thomas Chandler Haliburton to illuminate political as well as literary traditions by contrast and concludes that the satirical humourist cannot be fitted into a Canadian tradition. James Reaney in an imaginative analysis of the poetry of Isabel Vallancy Crawford discovers a symbolic treatment of the Canadian wilderness which suggests to him a model for indigenous poetry but finds E. J. Pratt the only heir. It is disillusioning to find Earle Birney, in his essay on "E. J. Pratt and his Critics" concluding that Pratt has no followers and that, until Canadian critics and poets once more appreciate the verve and realism of epic poetry and a desire to communicate a philosophy, he will not be part of a tradition. Only A. J. M. Smith finds his subject, Duncan Campbell Scott, less isolated, and he uses effective quotations to show that Scott was one of the school of nature poets but endowed with more sense or movement and more passion than his contemporaries. Again I found the French-Canadian studies disappointing. The biographical and social background is there but J. S. Tassie had little to say of the influence of Philippe Aubert de Gaspé on French-Canadian novels and Guy Sylvestre does not attempt to analyse Garneau's influence on the historical interpretation of French Canada. Possibly French-Canadian traditions are so alive that they are taken for granted. Robin Harris has concentrated on Egerton Ryerson's influence on our school system although without attempting to assess the influence of his educational philosophy in the schools. And Barker Fairley uses F. H. Varley to deplore the surrender of modern Canadian art to an impersonal and uncommunicated introspection at best, which, by rejecting tradition, has lost the chance of significant development.

One Canadian tradition still very much alive is to compliment an editor for taking the trouble to produce a book. The lectures by Careless, Farr, Smith, and Fairley, to name my own preferences, are enough to make this book worthwhile although I have reservations about yet another volume in the series which would deal with men less influential and more obscure.

H. BLAIR NEATBY

Laurier House
Ottawa

The American Economic Impact on Canada. By HUGH G. J. AITKEN, JOHN J. DEUTSCH, et al. Duke University Commonwealth-Studies Center. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press; London: Cambridge University Press. 1959. Pp. xviii, 176. \$4.50.

THESE LECTURES are a product of the debate over Canadian-American relations that was awakened, among other causes, by concern over the growing extent of American control of this country's industrial capacity. So many developments—emotional as well as economic—have transpired since the papers were presented

at the Duke University Study Seminar during the summer of 1958 that in some measure they have been outdated by the march of events and relegated to being historically rather than currently significant. However the seven papers collectively offer so much information, analysis, perspective, and insight that the volume seems assured of a permanent place in the literature of Canadian-American relations.

As is usual with a collection of related essays, the individual presentations vary in approach, scale, and manner of treatment, neglecting some aspects and placing disproportionate weight upon others. There is considerable repetition, notably in the several reviews of the general trends over past centuries and in the descriptions of present-day American investment in Canada. Much of the material of Professor Deutsch's survey of trade policies and foreign investment, for example, is paralleled by other articles that also treat these subjects in detail. The papers of Professor Lamontagne and Principal Mackintosh are mostly introductory backgrounds and present only brief suggestive sketches on the subjects of the American economic impact on Quebec or upon the economic policies of Canadian governments since the second World War. Professor Barber's study of the effects of American price-support and "giveaway" programmes on the position of the western Canadian grain farmer constitutes a thorough treatment of a rather specialized subject.

All but one of the presentations agree in making impartial exposition their main purpose. Dr. Forsey's article on labour inter-relationships, however, adopts a different viewpoint and is a defence of the Canadian labour movement against accusations of American control as well as a historical survey and examination of the current situation. This gives the paper a certain argumentative quality which contrasts with the cautious descriptions, balanced analyses, and guarded conclusions of the remaining studies. Few will quarrel with the observation that "for all practical purposes, and with rare exceptions, the autonomy [of internationally-affiliated unions] is complete." But still it is rather disappointing that no effort is made to examine the "rare exceptions" like the Teamsters, or episodes like the choice of Canada as a battleground for international tests of strength between management and labour.

To the present reviewer the papers by Professors Aitken and Brecher are the most successful of the group and taken together with Professor Deutsch's contribution they form the core of the volume. Professor Aitken's concern is with the developmental patterns of several staple industries, the dependence upon markets in the United States, and the manner in which economic conditions and public policies have operated to regulate quantities, prices, and the degree of processing of the materials traded. The examination of the play of forces in the newsprint, nickel, petroleum, and natural gas industries is clear, concise, and stimulating, a model of its type. Professor Brecher, who deals with the problems of foreign control of the Canadian economy, proceeds by examining the most commonly-expressed complaints and opinions. He recognizes the Canadian public's concern and urges the adoption of certain measures of control that will allay the more justifiable complaints without at the same time inviting "a substantial slowing-down of national development" which, he feels, the public for all its expressed concern is unprepared to accept as the price of greater economic independence.

Of the several studies it is Professor Brecher's, with its call for further investigation and its halting proposals of limited action, which best exemplifies the inhibitions of the scholar confronted by the knowledge that the present-day economic relationship involves both problems and benefits for Canada. Indeed such ambivalence and resigned acceptance of current trends is characteristic of the volume

as a whole. Apparently solutions to the perplexities of Canada's economic relationship with the United States come no more easily to scholarly theoreticians than they do to political leaders.

MORRIS ZASLOW

University of Toronto

Frontier America: The Story of the Westward Movement. By THOMAS D. CLARK. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1959. Pp. xiv, 832. \$11.95.

The Making of an American Community: A Case Study of Democracy in a Frontier County. By MERLE CURTI. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1959. Pp. xii, 483. \$8.50.

THE BOOKS under review remind us forcibly that Frederick Jackson Turner is still a vigorous figure in American historical writing. They seem at first glance to be thoroughly unlike, but however differently they approach it, the two books have a single subject—the ideas of Frederick Jackson Turner. Thomas D. Clark's *Frontier America* is the latest survey of the subject Turner put into university calendars. *The Making of an American Community* by Merle Curti and associates is an effort to discover, by viewing a small region microscopically, whether Turner was right in tracing democracy to frontier influences.

Like most current textbooks in American history, *Frontier America* is an elaborate synthesis decorated profusely with maps and illustrations. One suspects that, in this case, more care was lavished upon the format than upon the substance of the book. Indeed, as an intellectual performance *Frontier America* is weak enough to remind one of much of the other work in frontier history. The discussion is surprisingly uneven and inconsistent. Parts of the subject are handled very well, the Ohio Valley for example, but the author is uncomfortable west of the Mississippi, and he entirely overlooks frontiers contemporary with that of the Ohio Valley, such as New York and Georgia. Like many other frontier historians, but unlike Turner, he often writes as though the frontier existed in a vacuum. We read in vast detail of the deeds of obscure backwoodsmen and rarely or never of national events relating to the West. Professor Clark's style is often absorbing, but it can also be pedestrian, cluttered, and downright foggy. The lengthy bibliography is a shambles; any specialist in the field can readily find several dozen glaring errors, inconsistencies, and omissions (including many of the best recent books). All things considered, *Frontier America* is neither a satisfactory textbook nor an example of good historical writing.

Professor Curti's book is much the more intriguing of the two. He, with his collaborators, sets out to test Turnerian theory "objectively." For this purpose he relies heavily upon impersonal, statistical analysis, studying a small region—Trempealeau County, Wisconsin—for which statistics are plentiful. He makes elaborate use of the original census returns and of the extensive local records. As might have been expected, the statistical method works best on economic topics; for others, such as education, the procedure is more conventional. In the course of a long book, Professor Curti examines a large number of topics—political, economic, social, and cultural—in his attempt to discover whether the frontier in Trempealeau County bred democracy. The microscopic analysis will interest many historians who are dissatisfied with the generalizations of national histories, and the statistical method may inspire some emulation. Yet we may properly wonder whether history can be reduced to graphs, tables, and averages, and many readers

will draw comfort from the fact that Professor Curti is unable to treat all topics in this fashion, while his statistics are often so unrevealing that their use will be limited. The objectivity the author seeks is elusive, as usual, for he cannot always be statistical, and his definition of "democracy" has a way of adjusting itself to fit the available facts. Much labour of thought and writing that is properly the author's is left to the reader. Professor Curti warns that statistics do not make easy reading, but the reader's hard work is not limited to the statistical passages. There is so much of the repetitive, the trivial, and the obvious and so little of clear-cut answers to sharply-defined questions that many readers who do not give up entirely will read the book for its by-products, such as the enlightening sections on local government or immigrant life, rather than for a thesis that is frequently absent or buried.

Both books are Turnerian, but in different ways. Both revise and amend Turner. Professor Clark uses as his framework the Turnerian concept of a moving frontier; he views the nation through Western eyes, when he views it at all; and he expounds the romantic view of the West. Professor Curti's view is also Western, but it is not very romantic, and of course his frontier does not move; in fact, he writes local history rather than "frontier" history in the Turnerian sense. Of the two, Curti is closer to Turner in profession and farther from him in practice. Professor Clark's initial chapter is a competent summary of recent thought about Turner, embracing the important revisions. But he wears these heresies lightly, and they seldom appear in the body of the narrative. Professor Curti, on the other hand, asserts triumphantly that the Trempealeau County frontier promoted democracy in good Turnerian style, but not all readers will agree that he has proved it. He shows that opportunities existed, but he also shows that they were far from unlimited. Whether the result should be called "democracy" is a matter for definition. His comparisons of groups within Trempealeau County are numerous and instructive, but internal comparisons provide an uncertain guide to frontier influence. He might have been more disturbed than he was to find that in the one case in which Trempealeau and an eastern community were compared they were found to be nearly identical. One of his most enlightening sections is very damaging to all of Turnerian theory, but this is not noticed: if a large majority of the settlers stayed only a short time, as he shows clearly, what becomes of the permanent influence of the frontier? Did the frontier exist independently of the frontiersmen? Some of Professor Curti's collaborators are evidently less bound by Turnerian precepts than he is, for the chapters are uneven in thought as well as style. The chapters by Professor Van Hise, especially, are distinctly not Turnerian; they are also, by the way, much more lucid and enlightening than most of the others.

Professor Curti and his colleagues have added much to our knowledge of the process of settlement, but they have not simplified or solved the questions in the Turnerian debate. Professing to document Turnerian thought, they have actually modified it quite substantially and meanwhile adopted new approaches that may eventually replace Turner's. Professor Clark tries to stay aloof from such questions and does offer some interesting amendments to the old story, but he uses the Turnerian framework in a largely Turnerian way. Both books remind us that the immense variety of Western experiences is not readily compressed into a short list of generalizations. The chief effect of the two books may be to demonstrate that the Turnerian concept has become almost bankrupt.

WALLACE D. FARNHAM

University of Alberta

Martin Van Buren and the Making of the Democratic Party. By ROBERT V. REMINI. New York: Columbia University Press. 1959. Pp. xii, 271. \$5.25.

MR. REMINI'S BOOK, a by-product of a full-length biography of Martin Van Buren which he has in preparation, is a careful study in means. Van Buren's leadership, in fashioning a national Democratic party from the remnants of the old Republican party of the Virginia dynasty, has long been recognized. Mr. Remini explains the political activities of the "Little Magician" during the crucial years of this process, 1821-8. Beginning in the "Era of Good Feelings," when President Monroe kept up the pretence of a single national party, the book shows how Van Buren, from his secure base in New York politics, set about to combine the miscellaneous opponents of John Quincy Adams into a disciplined organization supporting the candidature of Andrew Jackson. In this transformation issues were subordinated to the arts of political management. Beyond a desire to return to Jeffersonian principles (already inappropriate for the times) and an assertion of states' rights views, Van Buren contributed little to the ideology of the party he was creating.

Van Buren is generally regarded as one of the first of the professional politicians on the national level in American history, a symbol of the movement in the 1820's towards manhood suffrage and popular nominating conventions. Yet it is remarkable how painfully he learned to accept the fact that in the future effective political activity would have to be directed towards the masses of new voters rather than to the membership of the caucus. He had matured as a party manager in the comfortable, closely-knit world of the Albany Regency; from Washington he attempted to apply the same methods in spite of the workings of the democratic forces associated with the emergence of new state constitutions in the West. Thus in 1824 he strongly supported W. H. Crawford, the choice of his own discredited Congressional caucus, as Republican presidential candidate, opposed the movement in New York to have state electors chosen by the people rather than by the legislature, failed to win the New York electors for Crawford, and could not carry the vital New York state delegation for Crawford when the presidential election was thrown into Congress in 1825. These events, representing a series of shattering reverses to a man renowned for his political shrewdness, taught Van Buren a great deal. In 1826, although his arch-rival De Witt Clinton narrowly gained election as governor of New York, Van Buren succeeded in creating serious discord between Clinton and Adams and confirmed his position as the political master of the state. For the next two years he moved with assurance in Congress and around the country, working, by the most adroit tactics, to create a unified party organization out of the congeries of anti-Adams men. In the elections of 1828 he received his double reward: the governorship of New York for himself and the presidency for Andrew Jackson.

On a number of points Mr. Remini corrects what have been accepted interpretations of Van Buren's career, as illustrated in such standard histories as George Dangerfield's *The Era of Good Feelings*. He shows, for instance, that the failure of the New York Democrats to endorse J. C. Calhoun's nomination for Vice-President in 1828 did not represent sinister plotting against Calhoun by the ambitious Van Buren. More important, he upsets completely the view that Van Buren, the "Red Fox," deliberately introduced the famous Tariff of Abominations into Congress with the purpose of killing it for his own electioneering advantages. In a thorough analysis of this episode Remini shows that Van Buren was confident of the loyalty of the South to Jackson and that his tariff was designed to win votes for "Old Hickory" in regions where they were most needed. That he intended to defeat the tariff was an allegation made later by the hostile Calhoun, which, although

unsupported, has been faithfully repeated by historians ever since. Mr. Remini's skill in investigating these troublesome aspects of Van Buren's career leads the reader of the present volume to look forward to his projected biography of this complex figure who has been called the American Talleyrand.

D. M. L. FARR

Carleton University

Friends: Sixty Years of Intimate Personal Relations with Richard Bedford Bennett.

By LORD BEAVERBROOK. London: Heinemann [Toronto: British Book Service (Canada) Limited]. 1959. Pp. x, 137, illus. \$2.50.

R. B. BENNETT has had a bad press in a Canada where for years his opponents had things their way in politics, the newspapers, and the writing of history. He had a taste for the things Canadian Liberals disapprove of—the Empire, protection, hereditary honours. Even his departures from the tory pattern were not endearing, his venture in the direction of a welfare state seeming to his opponents to smack more of Mussolini than of Roosevelt.

Many Canadians admired Bennett, but few loved him. *Friends* does more to establish Beaverbrook's capacity for friendship than to upset the tradition of Bennett's unexampled talent for making enemies. For Beaverbrook, Bennett remained his boyhood hero, always the elder, the man who almost did for imperial consolidation what he himself failed to do. Beaverbrook's newspapers brought him the appearance of great power but Bennett achieved the substance of the highest office in his country's gift. Max Aitken is a good hater. He never forgets his feud with Baldwin, "at most times a humbug and not infrequently a hypocrite." Yet for the occasional coolnesses between himself and Bennett he generously assumes responsibility. He failed to support Bennett in 1930, "I was guilty of bad judgment and I was wanting in courage." Two years later Bennett failed to invite him to the Ottawa Conference. He "was not free from rancour," admits the faithful Beaverbrook, but "the fault was mine."

Friends says little about the election of 1935 except to attribute Bennett's disaster to his failure at the Ottawa Conference. Beaverbrook claims that in 1967 papers deposited in Fredericton will prove that Bennett saved Canada from complete ruin in the financial crisis of the 1930's. It would be interesting to know what he thought of R. B.'s "New Deal of 1935." *Friends* does not tell us.

L. G. THOMAS

University of Alberta

Records of the Nile Voyageurs, 1884-1885: The Canadian Voyageur Contingent in the Gordon Relief Expedition. Edited with and Introduction by C. P. STACEY. Toronto: The Champlain Society. 1959. Pp. x, 285. Free to members.

IN THE SUMMER of 1884 the Imperial Federation League was formed in London to promote a closer unity of the British Empire, thus founding a movement which its proponents hoped would culminate in a formal political federation of the self-governing colonies and the United Kingdom. The ultimate objective was obviously a long-term proposition even to its firmest supporters, but it was assumed that the Mother Country and the colonies could co-operate on specific projects thereby creating an appreciation of common interests and the experience of working successfully together. A splendid opportunity for the demonstration of this co-operative imperial policy presented itself in the very same month as the League's founding when a reluctant Gladstone finally submitted to popular pressure and decided to dispatch an expedition to rescue General Gordon who had

been besieged at Khartoum. The expedition was commanded by General Lord Wolseley who, when faced with the problem of transporting a large force up the Nile, recalled a similar experience in the Canadian West and requested the services of three hundred Canadian voyageurs to guide his boats into the Sudan.

The story of these voyageurs is in a general way well known, but now the Champlain Society in another handsome volume presents a collection of documents relating to the Canadian part in the expedition. The material has been compiled from a variety of sources and includes official correspondence on the raising of the contingent, nominal rolls, records of the expedition, and a fascinating diary kept by the group's Canadian commander, Colonel Frederick Denison. The text is accompanied by excellent maps and several interesting illustrations. In an admirable introduction, a model of brevity and precision, the editor, C. P. Stacey, describes generally the background and experience of the Canadian force and provides answers to questions which have come to mind concerning it. For example, some contemporary critics questioned the sense of recruiting colonials for a work which might have been performed just as satisfactorily and more economically by boatmen from, say, the Thames. Certainly some of this criticism was justified since a few of the recruits could hardly be called voyageurs (eight at least were lawyers) and those from Winnipeg especially proved to be hopelessly incompetent. Dr. Stacey concludes that on balance, however, the Canadians performed a first-rate and valuable piece of work. Another point of interest about the Canadian presence in the Nile expedition centers on its usefulness as a symbol of imperial unity, a question which was shortly to become of the greatest importance when later in the campaign some colonies actually offered fighting troops to the British Government and when at least one prominent Canadian figure, Sir Charles Tupper, urged his government to follow their example and display an enthusiasm for imperial solidarity. This issue (on which Dr. Stacey has written elsewhere) did not arise in the case of the voyageurs who were recruited solely by British authorities with the permission of, but without further assistance by the Canadian Government. They were throughout the campaign in the employ of the British Army: they were not a Canadian contingent, but merely a group of Canadians serving in a British expedition. Their status and the apathy of the Canadian Government toward the whole expedition foreshadowed what was to become a consistent Canadian attitude of relative disinterest in imperial adventures. For the voyageurs themselves the circumstances of their recruitment put them in an awkward position. Since they were in the imperial service, the Canadian authorities took no financial responsibility for them, but ironically the British Government argued that they were only under "special contract" and refused for a long time to pay to Canadian officers gratuities which were given to all imperial officers in the expedition.

GUY MACLEAN

Dalhousie University

Noted

Karamzin's Memoir on Ancient and Modern Russia: A Translation and Analysis. By RICHARD PIPES. Harvard Russian Research Center Studies, 33. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1959. Pp. xiv, 266. \$7.25.

THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK of Russian conservatism from Arakcheev to Pobiedonostsev has hitherto received only scanty attention. Hence Professor Pipes' careful edition of Karamzin's *Memoir* is an extremely valuable contribution.

Written in 1810-11 for the edification of Alexander I, Karamzin's essay was one of the important cornerstones of Russian conservatism. It emphasized the rôle of autocracy in Russian history, it criticized Alexander's hasty if well-intentioned reforms, and it elaborated on the merits of Russia's traditional institutions. Professor Pipes deserves full credit not only for providing a good translation of the *Memoir*, but for placing it in its historical context, and for supplying it with careful annotations and a bibliography.

Quaker Ways in Foreign Policy. By ROBERT O. BYRD. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1960. Pp. xxi, 230. \$5.00.

MR. BYRD has written an excellent analytical study of the Quaker approach to international relations. He is secure in his knowledge of essential Quaker doctrine and its political implications, and especially in his appreciation that for Quakerism power is a spiritual and moral instrument to be used to achieve harmony among individuals and peoples, not a means of coercion to protect the security of an established order. These concepts the author states and evaluates clearly and impartially in the first half of his book, choosing his illustrations from many original sources, some as far back as George Fox's own writings, and others so recent the ink has barely dried. The six final chapters, which trace in detail the Quaker effort since the 1640's to reconstruct international relations in the image of Christian teaching, are based on a formidable mastery of a host of official and private Quaker records, and make an original contribution to the history of Quakerism, albeit a highly specialized one.

Law and Authority in Early Massachusetts: A Study in Tradition and Design. By GEORGE LEE HASKINS. New York: The Macmillan Company [Galt: Brett-Macmillan Ltd.]. 1960. Pp. xviii, 298. \$5.00.

PROFESSOR HASKINS, the son of Charles Homer Haskins, is both lawyer and historian, as his four previous books and several articles on English mediaeval and American legal history have shown. This latest volume is a highly technical and formidably detailed treatment of the evolution in the first two decades of Massachusetts history of its governmental institutions and its substantive law. Two main generalizations emerge from this account. On the one hand, the English mediaeval and early modern legal tradition played a powerful role in shaping the public-law aspect of the Massachusetts legal system. On the other hand, the settlers consciously attempted to create law appropriate to the Puritan ideals which had originally stimulated the epochal "errand into the wilderness," and this factor decisively coloured every inherited tradition. In his treatment of the substantive law the author shows in detail how the colonists, as their ideals and the conditions of settlement dictated, adopted, adapted, or abandoned the concepts of the common and statute law and the Bible, and the practices of the ecclesiastical courts, the J. P.'s, and the local courts of the manors and boroughs from which the settlers originally came. It is an enormously complicated subject, and Professor Haskins makes a sound contribution to it. And a timely one too, for the early history of American law has only just begun to be written.

New Zealand, 1769-1840: Early Years of Western Contact. By HARRISON M. WRIGHT. Harvard Historical Monographs, XLII. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1959. Pp. xii, 225. \$6.25.

DR. H. M. WRIGHT has written a compact readable account of the history of

northern New Zealand before 1840. In simple straightforward style, he explains how contact with the Maori in the 1820's was made chiefly by whalers and missionaries—the latter apparently attempting to counteract the evils introduced by the former. Among these first missionaries Samuel Marsden of the Church Missionary Society stands out as a strong, stubborn character, a real exponent of muscular Christianity. In this early European settlement, according to Marsden, "Satan maintained his dominion without molestation; and there was here a state of affairs where 'The White Population is free from any constraint of the law.'" Coming up against these first emissaries of the outer world, the Maori emerge as an intelligent, keenly observant people, quickly aware of the dichotomy between the words of the Holy Book and the actions of drunken whalers who despoiled their women and sold muskets.

On the whole, one could not get a better picture of Maori society than that depicted within the reasonable limits of this small book, although one would like to know more about over-all British policy towards New Zealand which culminated in the Treaty of Waitanga, 1840. Admittedly the author in his preface states: "This book discusses aspects of the history of northern New Zealand from the point of view of the interaction between the Maori and Western Society." However, one would like to think that someone other than those on the spot was concerned with the destiny of these remote islands in the immediate years before 1840.

Socialism in One Country, 1924–1926. II. A History of Soviet Russia. By EDWARD HALLETT CARR. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd. [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1959. Pp. viii, 493. \$9.00.

THE LATEST VOLUME in this weighty study of the Bolshevik régime represents Mr. Carr at his best. Having treated economic policy in the first volume in his trilogy on the years 1924–1926, he now turns his attention to internal politics and administration, reserving foreign affairs for the forthcoming third volume. At all times a splendid synthesis, the latest of Mr. Carr's studies at times runs well beyond the bounds of previous knowledge. He is especially illuminating in his treatment of the role of the Komsomol in the intra-party struggle, the way in which Zinoviev's Leningrad stronghold was reduced by the stalinist Central Committee, and the specific activities of the Politburo and Orgburo in the stalinization of the party. In discussing state administration Mr. Carr tends to pay little attention to the contributions of previous western scholarship on the structure of the central organs, the question of nationality, the army, and the security forces. But his mastery of Soviet sources establishes his study as the most thorough existing investigation of its broad subject.

Arctic Wings. By WILLIAM A. LEISING. Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday and Company, Inc. [Toronto: Double day Publishers]. 1959. Pp. 335, illus. \$5.75.

THIS AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL account of an American-born Oblate missionary's experiences in northern Canada spans the years from 1940 to 1958. When the author first arrived at Fort Smith it was to embrace the traditional career of missionary *cum* welfare worker, surgeon, hunter, dogsled, and riverboat operator. But before long he was drafted as carpenter, tractor driver, dentist, travel lecturer, and finally, flying priest. The years after 1951 found him continuously occupied ferrying legates, bishops, and clergy on tours of inspection, vacations, and postings, collecting native children for the residential schools, undertaking

emergency rescue flights, and freighting the foodstuffs, supplies, and equipment required for the smooth functioning of the Church's far-flung religious and welfare enterprises. His book is an interesting portrayal of the missionary's life in the age of the bulldozer, airplane, and Dew-line station and throws considerable light upon the characters of aged veterans of the order and their younger successors, not least, the author himself.

Flame of Power: Intimate Profiles of Canada's Greatest Businessmen. By PETER C. NEWMAN. Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co., 1959. Pp. 264, illus. \$4.95.

IT IS UNFAIR, perhaps, to judge such a book as this as a historical work. The eleven studies are interesting and generally informative, although on occasion—particularly in the case of Sir Donald Smith—the journalist-author is guilty of gross historical errors. From an historian's point of view the essays are superficial, and it is puzzling and disturbing to see how far apart historical and journalistic biography can be. At the same time no Canadian historian will have wasted his time by an evening with Newman's heroes.

Pathfinders in the North Pacific. By MARIUS BARBEAU. Caldwell, Idaho: Caxton Printers, Ltd. [Toronto: The Ryerson Press]. 1958. Pp. 235, illus. \$6.00.

THIS CURIOUS VOLUME by a well-established Canadian anthropologist deals with the opening of the Northern Pacific by Russian and British traders and explorers 1740 and 1860. The economic lure of the area was the valuable sea otter. The pelts of this little animal provided the pivot product for a lucrative triangular trade stretching from Europe through the North Pacific to the Orient. The author stretches his case rather far in claiming that the importance of the Eastern tea trade, which was based on the sea otter pelts so valued by the Chinese, was ultimately the cause of the American Revolution.

The later chapters in the book describe the degradation of the natives by traders, and the conflict between the Russians and the British. Finally, for some not very apparent reason, the book closes with two rather chatty chapters on the Klondike Gold Rush and one on a northern Pacific missionary, William Duncan. Despite the publishers claim that the work contains much on the history of the area "which it would be most unwise to ignore," few historians will find the book particularly useful.

Graduate Theses in Canadian History and Related Subjects

THE *Canadian Historical Review* presents herewith its thirty-third annual list of graduate theses which are in course of preparation or have recently been completed. Included in the list are titles not only in Canadian history but also in such related subjects as Canada's external relations, Canadian economics, law, and geography, and a selection of historical titles which bear indirectly rather than directly on Canadian history.

We wish to express our appreciation of the generous co-operation which we have received from a large number of universities throughout the Commonwealth, the United States, and Canada, in the compilation of this information. We shall be very grateful to have mistakes or omissions drawn to our attention.

Theses for the Doctor's Degree

- MILTON F. BAUER, B.A. Western Ontario 1947; M.A. Toronto 1949. The Credit Union movement in the province of Quebec. *Chicago*.
- A. B. M. BELL, B.A. Queen's 1935; M.A. 1935. The office of the Governor General in the twentieth century. *Toronto*.
- H. H. BINHAMMER, B.A. Western Ontario 1948; M.A. Queen's 1957. A study of the Canadian Housing Sector. *McGill*.
- M. BLANAR, M.A. Loyola. Canada as seen by British travellers in the 18th century. *London*.
- M. J. BOOTE, B.A. Wales 1950; Ph.D. McGill 1959. Certain taxation aspects of corporate finance in Canada. *McGill*.
- JOSEPH A. BOUDREAU, B.A. U.C.L.A. 1956; M.A. 1958. The Canadian War-time Elections Act of 1917. *U.C.L.A.*
- D. BOUSQUET, B.A. McGill 1948; M.A. 1951; Ph.D. 1953. Commonwealth history since 1887. *Cambridge*.
- WILBUR FEE BOWKER, B.A., Alberta 1930; LL.B., 1932; LL.M. Minnesota 1953. Reception of English law in Canada. *Yale*.
- CHANDLER BRAGDON, B.A. Cambridge 1931; M.A. 1934. Canadian reactions to the foreign policy of the United States, 1934-9. *Rochester*.
- R. C. BROWN, B.A. Rochester 1957; M.A. Toronto 1958. Canadian-American relations in the latter part of the nineteenth century. *Toronto*.
- A. A. BURNETT, B.Sc. McGill 1955; M.A. 1956. Financing municipal government in Canada. *McGill*.
- K. J. CABLE, B.A. Sydney 1950; M.A., 1952; B.A. Cambridge 1954. The development of university education in the British Empire, 1815-80. *Cambridge*.
- LOVELL C. CLARK, B.A. Queen's 1949; M.A. 1950. The eclipse of Canadian Conservatism, 1891-1901. *Toronto*.
- ROBERT LYONS COMEAU, B.A. St. Francis Xavier 1947; M.A. 1952. Financial intermediaries as a factor in monetary instability: The Canadian case.
- G. RAMSAY COOK, B.A., Manitoba 1954; M.A. Queen's 1956; Ph.D. Toronto 1960. Political ideas of J. W. Daffoe, 1866-1944. *Toronto*.

- BROOKE CORNWALL, B.A. British Columbia 1949; M.A. 1952. The geographical regions of the Canadian cordillera. *Clark*.
- HARRY SHERMAN CROWE, B.A. Manitoba 1947; M.A. Toronto 1948. The state and economic life in Canada. *Columbia*.
- PAUL E. CRUNICAN, B.A. Western Ontario 1948; M.A. Toronto 1956. The Manitoba Schools question and Canadian federal politics. *Toronto*.
- R. STANLEY CUMMING, B.A. Dalhousie; M.A. McGill. The timber trade between Great Britain and the Canadian Maritime Provinces, 1809-54. *Oxford*.
- ROBERT A. DAVIS, B.A., Toronto 1948; M.A. Syracuse 1950. The Mississauga corridor: A study of the special arrangement of central places in the southern part of the province of Ontario. *Clark*.
- GRANT R. DAVY, B.A. Western Ontario 1949; A.M. Fletcher School 1950. Canadian policy on disarmament, 1945-55. *Fletcher School*.
- JOHN F. EARL, B.A. Western Ontario 1950; M.A. 1952. Analysis of post-war Canadian trade with Western Europe. *Clark*.
- D. K. FAIRBARN, B.Sc. McGill 1949; M.A. 1950. Foundations for agricultural policy. *McGill*.
- LAURENCE SIDNEY FALLIS, Jr., A.B. Michigan 1959; A.M. 1960. The idea of nationalism in Canadian thought: 1867-1914. *Michigan*.
- D. F. FORSTER, B.A. Toronto 1956; A.M. Harvard 1958. Origins and development of Canadian combines policy. *Harvard*.
- ALLAN M. FRASER, M.A. Edinburgh 1928. History of Newfoundland from the suspension of Dominion status to unity with Canada. *Columbia*.
- BARBARA J. L. FRASER, B.A. Toronto 1955; M.A. 1959. The office of the Governor General, 1848-1896. *Toronto*.
- M. G. FRY, B.Sc. London 1956. Anglo-American-Canadian relations, with special reference to Far Eastern and naval issues, 1918-22. *London*.
- J. A. GALBRAITH, B.Com. McGill 1948; M.Com. 1950; Ph.D. 1959. A study of Canadian banking. *McGill*.
- M. GRENON, B.A. Ottawa 1957; L. ès L. Montréal 1959. The French-Canadian reaction to Sir Guy Carleton, Lord Dorchester. *Toronto*.
- SAUL W. GREY, A.B. Brooklyn College 1952; A.M. Fletcher School 1955. Canada and NATO: A study of one country's approach to collective security. *Fletcher School*.
- NAOMI E. S. GRIFFITHS, B.A. London 1956; M.A. New Brunswick 1957. The formation of Canada's external policy, 1878-1906: a study of the importance of economic problems in Canadian external relations. *London*.
- J. R. S. HAMBLY, B.Sc. Alberta 1940; B.Ed. 1942; M.Ed. 1944; Ed. D. Toronto 1960. A survey of county school administration in Alberta. *Toronto*.
- B. E. HANDREN. British public opinion and national policy, 1812-1815, on American issues, with special reference to treaties of peace and commerce with the United States. *Edinburgh*.
- F. J. HAYES, B.Sc. London 1948; M.Com. McGill 1956; Ph.D. 1960. The pulp and paper industry in Canada: An analysis of the restrictions on competition. *McGill*.
- WELF H. HEICK, B.A. Western Ontario 1953. A study in Canadian politics: Career and administration of Alexander Mackenzie. *Duke*.
- BRUCE W. HODGINS, B.A. Western Ontario 1953; M.A. Queen's 1955. The career and administrations of John Sandfield Macdonald: A study in Canadian politics. *Duke*.
- WILLIAM H. N. HULL, B.A. Western Ontario 1951; M.A. 1955; Ph.D. Duke 1959. A comparative study of the problems of ministerial responsibility and public accountability in the public broadcasting systems of Canada and Australia. *Duke*.
- C. W. HUMPHRIES, B.A. McMaster 1955; M.A. Toronto 1959. Sir James Whitney. *Toronto*.
- WILLIAM A. JENKINS, B.S. Macdonald College 1942; M.S. Cornell 1947; M.P.A. Harvard 1958. Land use study-Digby County, Nova Scotia. *Harvard*.
- ALBERT W. JOHNSON, B.A. Saskatchewan 1942; M.A. Toronto 1945; M.P.A. Harvard 1950. Government planning in Saskatchewan, 1944-1960. *Harvard*.
- JAMES DONALD JOHNSON, B.A. Jamestown College 1950; A.M. North Dakota 1952; A.M. Michigan 1957. Pressure groups in the Canadian House of Commons. *Michigan*.

- E. W. KIERANS, B.A. Loyola 1935. Financing corporate activity in Canada, 1936-58. *McGill*.
- A. W. LANE, B.A. McGill 1947. The transportation policies of the federal government during the 1920's. *McGill*.
- LAURIER L. LAPIERRE, B.A. Toronto 1955; M.A. 1957. The career of Joseph Israel Tarte. *Toronto*.
- JAMES P. LOVEKIN, B.A. Toronto 1946; M.A. 1949; B.Ed. 1954. A study of a typical Ontario community, Durham County. *Queen's*.
- H. IAN MACDONALD, B.Com. Toronto 1952; B.A. Oxford 1954; B. Phil. 1955; M.A. 1958. Foreign investment in Canada since 1926. *Oxford*.
- MALCOLM MACDONELL, B.A. St. Francis Xavier 1938; M.A. Toronto 1945. The administration of Sir John Harvey-Newfoundland, 1841-6. *Toronto*.
- JOSEPH E. MCGURN, A.B. Hobart 1950; M.A. 1951. Canadian opinion about United States foreign policy 1914-20. *Rochester*.
- ALAN W. MACINTOSH, B.A. Dalhousie 1949; M.A. 1950; B.Ed. 1954; Ph.D. 1960. The career of Sir Charles Tupper in Canada, 1864-1900. *Toronto*.
- M. A. MCINTYRE. Canada-West Indies trade: An analysis of post-war trends and future developments. *Oxford*.
- B. K. MACLAURY, A.B. Princeton 1953; A.M. Harvard 1958. Canadian postwar monetary policy. *Harvard*.
- RONALD STUART MACLEAN, B.Sc. Alberta 1949; B.Ed. 1950; A.M. Fletcher School 1953. British, top-level personal diplomacy in two wartime coalitions: A comparison. *Fletcher School*.
- THOMAS H. MCLEOD, B.A. Manitoba 1940; A.M. Indiana 1941; M.P.A. Harvard 1948; Ph.D. 1960. Public enterprise in Saskatchewan: The development of public policy and administrative controls. *Harvard*.
- HUGH MACNIVEN, B.A. Western Ontario 1944; M.A. Stanford 1948; Ph.D. Minnesota 1960. The Legislative Assembly in the Canadian provinces. *Minnesota*.
- H. MACQUARRIE, B.A. Manitoba 1947; M.A. New Brunswick 1949. Sir Robert Borden and the Conservative party. *McGill*.
- NEVILLE KINGSLEY MEANEY, Ph.D. Duke 1959. The American attitude towards the British empire from 1919 to 1922: A study in the diplomatic relations of the English-speaking nations. *Duke*.
- A. MILTON MOORE, B.A. Queen's 1949; A.M. Chicago 1951. The pricing of Crown timber in eastern Canada. *Chicago*.
- JOHN DUNCAN MUNDIE, B.Com. Manitoba 1954; M.B.A. Ohio State 1955. Resale price maintenance and its effect upon marketing in Canada. *Stanford*.
- ALEXANDER L. MURRAY, B.A. McMaster 1953; M.A. London 1955. Canada and the Anglo-American anti-slavery movement: A Study in International Philanthropy. *Pennsylvania*.
- CAMERON NISH, B.A. Sir George Williams 1956. The intendancy of Gilles Hocquart. *Rochester*.
- W. H. PARKER, B.Sc., M.A., D.Phil. Oxford 1958. The geography of the province of Lower Canada in 1837. *Oxford*.
- E. PALMER PATTERSON II, B.A. Baylor 1948; M.A. Kansas 1953. Andrew Paul and Indian resurgence. *Washington* (Seattle).
- ANTHONY JAMES PEARCE, B.Sc. London 1952; Ph.D. California 1959. Imperialism and Political Expansion: A criticism of contemporary theories of imperialism based on an interpretation of Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Burke. *California*.
- JOHN ALEXIS PINCUS, A.B. Colby College 1948; A.M. Columbia 1950. Primary industry and the economic development of Canada. *Harvard*.
- ALAN R. PLOTNICK, B.A. Temple 1949; M.A., Pennsylvania 1951. Economic and commercial policy considerations affecting the marketing of western Canadian oil in the United States and the Montreal markets: A study of a post-war interrelated marketing problem. *Pennsylvania*.
- S. L. POLLARD, B.A. McGill 1929; M.A. 1930; L.Th. Montreal Diocesan College 1932. The Episcopate of Bishop Francis Fulford of Montreal, 1850-67. *McGill*.
- T. L. POWRIE, B.S.A. Saskatchewan 1954; M.A. 1955; B.Phil. Oxford 1957. Some aspects

- of the Canadian balance of payments, 1950 to 1958, with special reference to the mechanism of adjustment. *Oxford*.
- KENNETH GEORGE PRYKE, B.A. Carleton 1956; A.M. Duke 1958. Nova Scotia and Confederation to 1872. *Duke*.
- J. D. PURDY, B.A. New Brunswick 1953; M.A. Toronto 1954. John Strachan and education in Canada. *Toronto*.
- HERBERT F. QUINN, B.A. Sir George Williams 1941; M.A. McGill 1946; Ph.D. Columbia 1959. The Union Nationale party: A study of nationalism and industrialism in Quebec. *Columbia*.
- K. J. REA, Ph.D. London 1959. The Canadian Northwest; a study in sub-Arctic economic development, 1898-1958. *London*.
- S. PETER REGENSTREIF, B.A. McGill 1957. The Liberal party of Canada, 1896-1957. *Cornell*.
- R. L. REID, B.A. Adelaide 1953; M.A. 1954. The evolution of the Governor-General. *Minnesota*.
- WILLIAM OLIVER RICHMOND, B.S. Alberta 1957. Middle Devonian Reef study, Great Slave Lake, Northwest Territories, Canada. *Stanford*.
- W. RODNEY. The Comintern, Canada, and the United States, 1919-43. *London*.
- ERIC D. ROSS, B.A. New Brunswick 1951; M.A. 1954. Historical geography of exploration and fur trade in the Canadian Northwest, 1770-1821. *Edinburgh*.
- VALERIE J. ROSS, M.A. McGill 1957. Economic and social factors influencing the Selkirk migration to Canada. *McGill*.
- RONALD A. SHEARER, B.A. British Columbia 1954; M.A. Ohio State 1955. The impact of post-war private international investment on the development of the Canadian economy. *Ohio State*.
- ROBERT A. SHIELDS, B.A. Manitoba 1948; M.A. 1949. The Imperial Federation League, 1886-93: A study of its role in the movement for imperial unity in the late Victorian era. *Pennsylvania*.
- E. C. SIEVWRIGHT, B.Sc. London 1950. Impact of the oil industry on the economy of Alberta. *McGill*.
- G. GADDIS SMITH, B.A. Yale 1954; M.A. 1958. Canadian nationhood and Anglo-American relations, 1911-31. *Yale*.
- WILLIAM DAVID SMITH, B.A. Manitoba 1948; A.M. Harvard 1949. Sir Robert Borden's relations with his Conservative followers. *Toronto*.
- MELVIN P. STRAUS, B.S. Illinois 1949; M.A. 1950; Ph.D. 1959. Control of subversive activities in Canada. *Illinois*.
- JACK EUGENE THOMAS, A.B. Utah 1931; M.A. California 1950; Ph.D. 1959. SACEUR and SHAPE: A study of peacetime preparation for coalition defence, 1950-6. *California*.
- D. C. TWAY, A.B. Bluffton 1941; A.M. New York 1946. Hudson's Bay Company land policies, 1870-1930. *California* (Los Angeles).
- WALTER ULLMANN, B.A. British Columbia 1954; M.A. 1956. The Quebec bishops and Confederation. *Rochester*.
- DONALD F. WAHL, A.B. Middlebury 1953; A.M. Harvard 1958; Ph.D. 1959. Productivity and the structure of Canada's foreign trade. *Harvard*.
- JAMES D. WAHN, B.S. Saskatchewan 1942; M.S. 1947. The Canadian capital inflow, 1950-4. *Chicago*.
- HUGH WALLACE, B.A. Alberta 1941; M.A. Toronto 1948. Canadian-Asian relations, 1945-58. *Rochester*.
- R. WALLS. Scottish influences in Nova Scotia—religion, education, and politics. *Edinburgh*.
- JOHN WARENTIN, B.Sc. Manitoba 1948; M.A. Toronto 1954. The Mennonite settlements in Manitoba: A study in historical geography. *Toronto*.
- R. E. L. WATSON, B.A. Toronto 1948; M.A. 1949; Ph.D. 1960. The Nova Scotia Teachers' Union: A study in the sociology of formal organization. *Toronto*.
- ROSS A. WEBB. The mechanization of transport in Nova Scotia, 1825-1867. *Pittsburgh*.
- JOHN ROBERT WESTLAKE, B.A. Alberta 1942; LL.B. 1943. Canadian Labour Law. *Yale*.
- WALTER WHITE. The office of the Prime Minister in Canada. *Michigan*.

- GLYNDWR WILLIAMS, B.A. London 1954; Ph.D. 1959. The British search by sea for the North West Passage, 1719-94. *London*.
- HAROLD A. WILSON, B.A. Iowa 1950; M.A. 1952. Borden, Imperial statesmen. *Iowa*.
- KENNETH NEVILLE WINDSOR, B.A. Western Ontario 1955. The career of George Monro Grant. *Toronto*.
- S. F. WISE, B.A. Toronto 1949; B.L.S. 1950; M.A. Queen's 1953. Canadian Toryism, a study in "ideology." *Queen's*.
- ROBERT E. WYNNE, Ju.D. Vienna 1936; B.Ed. Alberta 1954; M.A. 1958. Popular reaction to oriental immigration in the State of Washington and in British Columbia. *Washington* (Seattle).

Theses for the Master's Degree

- W. P. ABRAHAM, B.A. Newfoundland 1956. The Church of England in Newfoundland, 1700-1839. *Newfoundland*.
- EMMANUEL NEWTON AFFUL, B.Sc. California 1958; M.Sc. Manitoba 1960. A study of the primary marketing costs for Manitoba potatoes. *Manitoba*.
- RICHARD ALLEN, B.A. Toronto. The social gospel and the radical political tradition in twentieth-century Canada. *Saskatchewan*.
- H. ANGELL, B.A. Sir George Williams 1958; M.A. McGill 1960. The Quebec general elections of 1923 and 1927. *McGill*.
- R. G. ARMSTRONG, B.A. Loyola 1956. The Standing Committee on Public Accounts, 1946-59. *McGill*.
- HAROLD DANIEL AUSTIN, B.A. New Brunswick 1958. The effect of subsistence agriculture on the economic level of the Atlantic Provinces. *New Brunswick*.
- D. AYRE, B.A. Sir George Williams 1954. The English-language press of Montreal and the South African War, 1899-1900. *McGill*.
- P. J. BANGS, B.A. Toronto 1958. The Liberal party and the election of 1891. *Toronto*.
- JEAN BARIL, B.A. Montréal 1956. Relations entre les grèves et les fluctuations économiques au Canada depuis 1900. *Montréal*.
- AILEEN E. BARKER, B.A. London 1958. Laurier, French Canada, and the Boer War. *British Columbia*.
- GUILDO BÉLANGER, B.A. Montréal 1956; M.A. 1960. Flexibilité des prix et des salaires: Etude empirique dans l'industrie canadienne pour la période d'après-guerre. *Montréal*.
- LISLES E. BERRINGER, B.A. Acadia 1952. The Nova Scotia Assembly, 1758-1848. *Acadia*.
- ROBERT BERTRAND, B.A. Montréal 1954; LL.D. 1958; M.A. 1959. Les origines du système bancaire canadien, 1820-1867. *Montréal*.
- D. H. BOCKING, B.Ed. Saskatchewan 1950; B.A. 1951; M.A. 1959. Premier Walter Scott: A study of his rise to political power. *Saskatchewan*.
- JAMES WILLMOTT BORCOMAN, B.A. New Brunswick 1955. The seigniorial system in French Canada after 1760. *New Brunswick*.
- L. J. BOYLE, B.A. Loyola 1957; B.Com. 1958. The problems of passenger traffic on Canadian railways. *McGill*.
- GÉRARD BROUSSEAU, B.A. Montréal 1955; M.A. 1960. L'Amérique, nouveau champ d'apostolat des Frères de l'Instruction Chrétienne. *Montréal*.
- JOHN P. BUELL, B.A. Toronto 1959. The political career of N. Clark Wallace. *Toronto*.
- F. T. R. BULLEN, B.A. Mount Allison 1959. The relations between Canada and the West Indies, 1910-1940. *Queen's*.
- MASSIMO CACOPARDO, B.A. Rome 1954; M.A. Montréal 1960. Le Canada et la communauté économique européenne: Etude des effets probables du marché commun européen sur le commerce extérieur du Canada. *Montréal*.
- FRANK B. CAMILEMI, B.S. Fordham 1952, M.B.A. New York 1959. A comparison of the dominion (federal) tax on corporate income in Canada and the United States. *New York*.
- SHIRLEY E. CARKNER, B.A. Carleton 1957. The elected senate in Canada under the Union. *Queen's*.
- A. J. E. CHILD, B.A. Queen's 1931; M.A. Toronto 1960. The predecessor companies of Canada Packers Limited. *Toronto*.
- GORDON CAMERON CHURCH, B.A. Saskatchewan 1957; M.A. 1960. The origin, nature,

- and development of the Saskatchewan Co-operative Creameries Association Limited. *Saskatchewan*.
- JOHN S. CHURCH, B.A. British Columbia 1945. The study of capital formation in British Columbia, 1895-1905, with particular reference to the mining industry in the West Kootenays. *British Columbia*.
- J. C. CLOUGH, B.A. Toronto 1930. Introduction to the papers of Bishop Mountain. *Toronto*.
- D. S. COHEN (Mrs.), B.A. Toronto 1955. Consumer credit in Canada. *McGill*.
- JOHN R. COURAGE, B.A. Newfoundland 1950; M.A. 1960. The development of procedure in the General Assembly of Newfoundland. *Newfoundland*.
- J. P. COUSENS, B.A. Queen's 1958. An analysis of the merger activities of Canadian Breweries, Limited. *Queen's*.
- FRANK CRAMM, B.A. Newfoundland 1959. The early period of railroad development in Newfoundland. *Newfoundland*.
- HARRY CUFF, B.A. Newfoundland 1952. Commission government in Newfoundland. *Acadia*.
- MICHAEL PETER CZUBOKA, B.A. Manitoba 1958; M.A. 1960. St. Peter's: A historical study with anthropological observations on the Christian aborigines of Red River, 1811-1876. *Manitoba*.
- WILLIAM GERALD D'ARCY, B.A. Alberta 1954. A comparison of savings habits in the United States and Canada. *New York*.
- JOCK M. DRUMMOND, B.A. British Columbia 1947. Geographical aspects of school construction and location in the greater Victoria school system. *British Columbia*.
- MELVA J. DWYER, B.A. British Columbia 1943. The relationship of Laurier and the national Liberal party to the British Columbia Liberal party. *British Columbia*.
- J. A. ELLIOTT, B.A. Western Ontario 1959. The mechanism of adjustment of the balance of payments to large inflows of capital in Canada 1949-59. *Queen's*.
- EDITH FARNCOMB, B.A. Western Ontario 1955. The history and significance of the London, Huron, and Bruce Railway. *Western Ontario*.
- D. FARQUHARSON, B.A. Toronto 1956. Quebec and the Canadian general election of 1900. *McGill*.
- STEPHEN FRANCIS JOHN FAY, B.A. New Brunswick 1958; M.A. 1960. Municipal finance in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. *New Brunswick*.
- WILLIAM FERGUSON, B.A. Western Ontario. Industrial development of south-western Ontario. *Western Ontario*.
- GARFIELD FIZZARD, B.A. Newfoundland 1960. The introduction of responsible government in Newfoundland, 1846-1855. *Newfoundland*.
- R. F. FLEMING, B.A. Western Ontario 1954. The lower Thames Valley. *Western Ontario*.
- J. E. FOSTER, B.A. Alberta 1959. The Protestant clergy and the Red River Colony. *Alberta*.
- BARBARA J. L. FRASER, B.A. Toronto 1955; M.A. 1959. The political career of Sir Hector Langevin. *Toronto*.
- J. M. FRASER. The International Joint Commission (United States-Canada). *Oxford*.
- BURK FREBOLD, B.A. Carleton. Rural land use trends of south-western Ontario. *Western Ontario*.
- WILLIAM R. GARDNER, B.A. Oregon 1953; M.S. 1955. Canada's post-war balance of payments and exchange problems. *Oregon*.
- MATHIEU GIRARD, B.A. Montréal 1955; B. Péd. 1957; M.A. 1960. Jules-Paul Tardivel, rédacteur en chef et propriétaire de la *Vérité*. *Montréal*.
- FRANCES K. GOODWIN, B.S. Johns Hopkins 1956; M.A. 1959. The Halifax Award of 1877: Antecedents and consequences, 1871-1885. *Johns Hopkins*.
- GENE M. GRESSLEY, B.S. Manchester College 1952; M.A. Indiana 1956. The Red River colony, 1811-34: A conflict between fur trade and settlement. *Indiana*.
- C. D. GRIMSON, B.A. McGill 1958. The Communist party in Canada. *McGill*.
- T. GRUEN, B.A. Sir George Williams 1955. The rôle of the mineral industry in Canadian economic development. *McGill*.
- S. H. HARTT, B.A. McGill 1958. Comparison of the labour legislation of France and the Province of Quebec. *McGill*.

- ROGER B. HAWKINS, B.A. Toronto 1952; A.M. New York 1959. United States capital investments in Canada. *New York*.
- IRENE W. HECHT, B.A. Radcliffe 1956. Israel D. Andrews and the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. *Rochester*.
- WELF H. HEICK, B.A. Western Ontario 1953. Historical and sociological study of the Lutherans of Waterloo County, Ontario. *Queen's*.
- E. J. HOLMGREN, B.A. British Columbia 1947; B.L.S. Toronto 1953. The Bar Colony. *Alberta*.
- MARYLIN GLYNN HUCK, B.A. Western Ontario 1956. Early settlement in Waterloo County (Upper Canada). *Toronto*.
- FREDERICK JOSEPH JACK, B.A. New Brunswick 1958. The status of Saint John and Halifax as major Canadian ports. *New Brunswick*.
- E. V. JACKSON, B.A. Toronto 1958. The organization of the Canadian Liberal party, 1867-73. *Toronto*.
- R. JOB, B.A. Durham 1957; M.Litt. 1959. The political career of Henry, Third Earl Grey. *Durham*.
- LEONARD JOHNSON, B.A. Toronto. The Utilization of sand lands in southern Ontario. *Western Ontario*.
- ROBERT A. JOHNSTON, B.Com. Toronto 1956. An analysis of the Canadian floating discount rate and its implications for monetary policy. *Yale*.
- OAKAH L. JONES, Jr., B.S. U.S. Naval Academy 1953. The Spanish occupation of Nootka Sound, 1790-5. *Oklahoma*.
- F. B. LAMONT. Canadian monetary policy, 1954-7. *Oxford*.
- W. R. LANGLOIS, B.A. Toronto 1959. The federal election of 1887 in Ontario. *Toronto*.
- CLAUDE LAROCHE, B.A. Montréal 1956. Les exportations canadiennes vers l'Europe. *Montréal*. *doctorat de l'Université de Montréal*.
- DIRKJE LAURENTIUS, Hist. Cand. Leyden 1957. History of Dutch activity in the Newfoundland fish trade, 1590-1680. *Newfoundland*.
- J.-J. LEMIEUX, B.A. Montréal 1955; M.A. 1959. Incidence du syndicalisme sur le salaire. *Montréal*.
- SAMUEL BAER LIPMAN, A.B. San Francisco State College 1956; M.A. California 1958. British political opposition to imperialism and the Empire, 1899-1906. *California*.
- DONALD LLOYD, B.A. Western Ontario. Land use trends of the Niagara peninsula. *Western Ontario*.
- DOROTHY ISABEL LOGGIE, B.A. Alberta 1950; B.Ed. 1952. The Peace River and the Peace River Valley before 1908. *Alberta*.
- FREDERICK EVERETT LOUNSBURY, B.A. New Brunswick 1953; M.A. 1960. Capital investment in the Atlantic region. *New Brunswick*.
- D. C. LYNE, B.A. Ireland 1950. The Irish in the Province of Canada, 1850-67. *McGill*.
- A. G. MACDOUGALL, B.A. McGill 1957; M.A. 1960. The Presbyterian Church in the Presbytery of Quebec 1875 to 1925. *McGill*.
- C. S. MCDOWELL, B.Ed. Saskatchewan 1955. The origin and development of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation. *Saskatchewan*.
- F. J. MCGILLY, B.A. St. Francis Xavier 1949. Structural development of a federal political party: The C.C.F. *McGill*.
- ROBERT MARVIN MCINNIS, B.A. Saskatchewan 1959; M.A. 1960. The regional distribution of personal income in Saskatchewan, 1950-51. *Saskatchewan*.
- DAVID LANNEN MCKEE, B.A. St. Francis Xavier 1958; M.A. New Brunswick 1960. Municipal finance in New Brunswick and Newfoundland during the postwar period. *New Brunswick*.
- D. A. MACLEAN, B.A. New Brunswick 1958. European economic integration and its meaning for Canada. *Dalhousie*.
- HANIBALL E. MANHERTZ, B.A. Mount Allison 1957; M.A. New Brunswick 1960. Social security in the Atlantic Provinces. *New Brunswick*.
- J. P. MARTYN, B.A. Western Ontario 1955. A study of border problems following the Rebellion of 1837. *Toronto*.
- ALAN M. MAY, B.S. M.I.T. 1957; M.B.A. New York 1959. A study of American bank financing of the Canadian petroleum industry. *New York*.

- P. M. MEISKOWSKI, B.Sc. McGill 1957; M.A. 1959. A study of the demand for Canadian imports. *McGill*.
- ROGER MENDELS, B.Com. McGill 1958. Some implications of Canadian tax law on growth. *McGill*.
- G. MILBURN, B.A. Durham 1953; M.A. 1960. The Ontario grammar schools, 1853-1871. *Durham*.
- D. D. M. MILLAR, B.A. Western Ontario 1955. The election of 1878 in Canada. *Toronto*.
- JACQUES MONET, B.A. Montréal 1955. French-Canadian loyalism, 1840-9. *Toronto*.
- EDWARD MOULTON, B.A. Newfoundland 1957. The political history of Newfoundland, 1861-1869. *Newfoundland*.
- J. MUGGERIDGE, B.A. Cambridge 1957. The relations between the reform movements in Upper and Lower Canada during the 1830's. *Toronto*.
- S. M. NASEER, B.A. Aligarh Muslim University 1957. Parliamentary control of public corporations in Canada. *McGill*.
- PETER F. NEARY, B.Sc. Newfoundland 1959. The political history of Newfoundland, 1869-1875. *Newfoundland*.
- JAMES SEGVARD NYMAN, B.A. British Columbia 1956; M.A. California 1958. Canadian Atomic Energy Policy. *California*.
- MABEL OLNEY, A.B. Rochester 1935. William Lyon Mackenzie's Rochester Years. *Rochester*.
- W. C. ORMSBY, B.A. Toronto 1948; M.A. Carleton 1960. Canadian union, 1839-45: The emergence of a federal concept. *Carleton*.
- GEORGE PARASCHOS, B.A. Pace College 1955; M.B.A. New York 1959. A study of Trans-Canada Pipelines, Limited. *New York*.
- JACOB PARSONS, B.A. Newfoundland 1954. The origins of Wesleyan Methodism in Newfoundland. *Newfoundland*.
- I. PEMBERTON, B.A. Bishop's 1958. The Anti-Slavery Society of Canada. *Toronto*.
- M. R. H. PIERCY, B.A. Birmingham 1955. Ireland and Irish emigration, 1846-60. *Birmingham*.
- EDNA ROBERTSON, B.A. Glasgow 1957; M.A. Michigan State 1959. Scottish emigration to British North America 1815-1860: Causes and consequences. *Michigan State*.
- E. ROSKIES (Mrs.), B.A. McGill 1954. Liberalism of Mackenzie King. *McGill*.
- J. H. ROSS, B.A. Mount Allison 1956; B.Ed. 1957. Canadian history-privateering in the War of 1812. *London*.
- JEAN-PAUL ROULEAU, B.A. Montréal 1948; L.Théo. 1956. Les investissements dans le Québec et l'Ontario, 1935-1955. *Montréal*.
- JAMES P. RYAN, B.A. Ottawa 1956. The *London Advertiser*. *Western Ontario*.
- R. E. SAUNDERS, B.A. Toronto 1957. John Beverley Robinson: His political career, 1812-40. *Toronto*.
- GEORGES SCHOETERS, B.A. Montréal 1955. L'importation de capitaux au Canada. *Montréal*.
- P. R. SCHWEITZER, B.A. Sir George Williams 1957; M.A. McGill 1960. The stability of the Canadian economy with special reference to unemployment insurance. *McGill*.
- ELINOR L. KYTE SENIOR, B.A. McGill 1952; M.A. Newfoundland 1960. The origin and political influence of the Orange lodges in Newfoundland, 1863-1890. *Newfoundland*.
- WILFRED TARLTON SHAW, B.A. Manitoba 1952; B.Ed. 1957; M.A. 1960. The role of John S. Ewart in the Manitoba School Question. *Manitoba*.
- D. J. SHERBANUK, B.A. Alberta 1950; LL.B. 1953. Receipt and realization of income. *Toronto*.
- JOHN W. SHY, B.S. U.S. Military Academy, West Point. James Abercromby and the campaign of 1758. *Vermont*.
- ALFRED H. SIEMENS, B.A. British Columbia 1956. Mennonite settlement in the lower Fraser Valley, British Columbia. *British Columbia*.
- BRIAN R. D. SMITH, B.A. British Columbia 1956; M.A. Queen's 1960. Sir Richard McBride and the Conservative party. *Queen's*.
- JEAN MARY SMITH, B.A. Bristol 1958. The *Toronto Globe* and the manpower problem, 1914-18. *Queen's*.
- S. C. D. SMITH, B.A. McGill 1953; B.A. Oxford 1955. Politics and the party system in the three Prairie Provinces, 1917-58. *Oxford*.

- DUFFERIN STEWART SPAFFORD, B.A. Saskatchewan 1960. The development of public telephone systems in the Prairie Provinces since 1930. *Saskatchewan*.
- SHIRLEY K. SPAFFORD, B.A. Saskatchewan 1959. The development of financial policies in Saskatchewan under Charles Avery Dunning. *Saskatchewan*.
- ALBERT FREDERICK SPROULE, B.Ed. Alberta 1954. The life and influence on the development of the Canadian West of Senator Patrick Burns. *Alberta*.
- R. M. STAMP, B.A. Western Ontario 1959. The political career of James D. Edgar. *Toronto*.
- RALPH M. SUSMAN, B.A. Scranton 1955. The Toronto experiment: A new concept in local government. *New York*.
- J. NEIL SUTHERLAND, B.A. British Columbia 1958; M.A. 1960. T. D. Pattullo as a party leader in British Columbia, 1929-1941. *British Columbia*.
- T. H. B. SYMONS, B.A. Toronto 1951; B.A. Oxford 1953. The "Pacific Scandal." *Toronto*.
- PIERRE TOUSIGNANT, B.A. Montréal 1955; B.Péd. 1956; M.A. 1960. La Gazette de Montréal, 1791-1796. *Montréal*.
- GILLIAN M. TOWNSEND, B.A. Liverpool 1959. Newfoundland in the early seventeenth century. *Liverpool*.
- G. E. M. TRATT, B.A. Mount Allison, 1955. The newspapers of Nova Scotia, with special reference to the period before 1867. *Mount Allison*.
- G. J. TULCHINSKY, B.A. Toronto 1957. The construction of the first Lachine Canal, 1819-1826. *McGill*.
- J. R. TURNBULL, B.A. Toronto 1952. The attitude of Canada West towards Confederation, 1864-7. *Toronto*.
- H. E. TURNER, B.A. McMaster 1956; M.A. Toronto 1959. The evangelical movement in the Church of England in the Diocese of Toronto, 1839-79. *Toronto*.
- W. B. TURNER, B.A. Toronto 1956. The career of Isaac Brock in Canada. *Toronto*.
- ROSEMARY TYZACK, M.A. St. Andrews 1958. The constitutional ideas and practices of Lord Dalhousie as Governor in Chief. *Queen's*.
- PAUL VANDALL, B.A. Western Ontario. Shoreline morphology of Essex County. *Western Ontario*.
- ROBERT H. VATTER, A.B. New York; M.B.A. 1959. Financing by the uranium mining industry in the United States and Canada, 1948-1958. *New York*.
- ROBERT I. VEXLER, B.A. Cornell 1959. The Alaska Boundary Award. *Rochester*.
- SR. FRANCIS XAVIER WALSH, B.A. Dalhousie 1936; B.L.Sc. Mt. St. Vincent 1948; M.A. Boston College 1958. The evolution of Catholic public schools in Nova Scotia. *Boston College*.
- CHARLES A. WETZEL, A.B. Ursinus College 1951; M.B.A. New York 1959. The investment potential of selected Canadian oil stocks. *New York*.
- MARY E. WHITESIDE, B.A. Dalhousie 1957. The Inter-colonial Railway and public opinion in the Maritimes, 1850-1876. *Toronto*.
- J. R. H. WILBUR, B.A. Mount Allison 1947. H. H. Stevens and the formation of the Reconstruction party. *Queen's*.
- CHARLES WILSON, B.A. Western Ontario. Industrial trends of the London area. *Western Ontario*.
- K. WILSON, B.A. Sheffield 1952; M.A. 1953; B.Ed. Manitoba 1958. The development of Canadian universities. *Manitoba*.
- C. E. WOOD, B.A. Manitoba 1956. Fiscal problems of the province of Ontario, 1924-1959. *Queen's*.
- EMILY J. WRIGHT, B.A. Alberta 1932; B.Ed. 1951. The history of the Highwood River Valley. *Alberta*.
- L. ZOLF, B.A. Manitoba 1956. The C.I.O. and Canadian-American politics, 1937-8. *Toronto*.

Recent Publications Relating to Canada

PREPARED IN THE EDITORIAL OFFICE OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS
BY MARION MAGEE

NOTICE in this bibliography does not preclude a later and more extended review.

The following abbreviations are used: *B.R.H.*—*Bulletin des recherches historiques*; *C.H.R.*—*Canadian Historical Review*; *C.J.E.P.S.*—*Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*; *R.H.A.F.*—*Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*.

See also *Canadiana*, a monthly list of Canadian publications prepared by the National Library, Ottawa; *External Affairs*, published monthly by the Department of External Affairs; *Journal of the Parliaments of the Commonwealth*, issued quarterly by the General Council of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association; and, in the *University of Toronto Quarterly*, "Letters in Canada," published in the July issue.

Sections of the bibliography omitted from this issue for reasons of space will be included in later issues.

I. CANADA'S COMMONWEALTH AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

ALEXANDER, FRED. *Canadians and Foreign Policy: The Record of an Independent Investigation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1960. Pp. vi. 160. \$3.95. To be reviewed later.

ANGLIN, DOUGLAS G. Canada and Apartheid (*International Journal*, XV (2), spring, 1960, 122-37).

DEUTSCH, JOHN J. A Canadian Looks at American Trade Policy (*American Economic Review*, L (2), May, 1960, 443-9).

MCCARTHY, RICHARD D. The Fenian Raid (*Niagara Frontier*, VII (1), spring, 1960, 24-8).

II. HISTORY OF CANADA

(1) General History

DEUTSCH, HERMAN J. The Evolution of the International Boundary in the Inland Empire of the Pacific Northwest (*Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, LI (2), April, 1960, 63-79, maps).

LAYNG, THEODORE E. Highlights in the Mapping of Canada (*Canadian Library*, XVI (6), May, 1960, 282-8).

LITTLE, C. H. The Maritime Museum (*Atlantic Advocate*, L (9), May, 1960, 41-4). A history of Canada's Maritime Museum since its founding in 1948.

RAND, IVAN C. Some Aspects of Canadian Constitutionalism (*Canadian Bar Review*, XXXVIII (2), May, 1960, 135-62).

- SCARROW, HOWARD A. Federal-Provincial Voting Patterns in Canada (*C.J.E.P.S.*, XXVI (2), May, 1960, 289-98).
- WILLOUGHBY, WILLIAM R. The St. Lawrence Seaway: A Study in Pressure Politics. (*Queen's Quarterly*, LXVII (1), spring, 1960, 1-10).
- WINKS, ROBIN W. A Nineteenth-Century Cold War (*Dalhousie Review*, XXXIX (4), winter, 1960, 464-70).

(3) New France

- FRÉGAULT, GUY. La Compagnie de la Colonie (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, XXX (1), jan.-mars 1960, 5-29; XX (2), avril-juin 1960, 127-49).
- GROULX, LIONEL. *Dollard: Est-il un mythe?* Montréal et Paris: Fides. 1960. Pp. 57. \$.75.
- JAMES, MEL. *The Unknown Conquest of Canada* (*Queen's Quarterly*, LXVII (1), spring, 1960, 76-85). The author gives a short account of the Kirke expedition of 1629.
- STEBBINS, CATHERINE L. Here I Shall Finish My Voyage! Omena, Mich.: Solle's Press. 1960. Pp. ii, 30, maps. \$1.75. A book discussing the place of death of Father Jacques Marquette.
- STECK, FRANCIS BORGLA. *Marquette Legends*. Edited by AUGUST REYLING. New York: Pageant Press, Inc. 1960. Pp. xxii, 350. \$5.00. To be reviewed later.

(4) British North America before 1867

- COOPER, LEONARD. *Radical Jack: The Life of the First Earl of Durham*. London: The Cresset Press [Toronto: Ambassador Books Ltd.]. 1959. \$6.00. To be reviewed later.
- CUNEO, JOHN R. *Robert Rogers of the Rangers*. New York and Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1959. Pp. xii, 308. \$7.00. To be reviewed later.
- JOHNSON, ALICE M. System and Regularity (*Beaver*, outfit 291, summer, 1960, 36-9). Miss Johnson the Archivist of the Hudson's Bay Company discusses the various journals of Governor Simpson.
- LAMB, W. KAYE, ed. *The Letters and Journals of Simon Fraser, 1806-1808*. Maps by C. C. J. BOND. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited. 1960. Pp. viii, 292. \$5.00. To be reviewed later.
- NUTE, GRACE LEE. Jehu of the Waterways (*Beaver*, outfit 291, summer, 1960, 15-19). The author describes the trips of Governor Simpson of the Hudson's Bay Company.
- PARKER, FRANKLIN. George Peabody and the Search for Sir John Franklin, 1852-1854 (*American Neptune*, XX (2), April, 1960, 104-11).

III. PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL HISTORY

(2) The Province of Quebec

- BOUCHARD, T. D. *Mémoires de T. D. Bouchard. II. Croissant la colline*. Préface de ALBERT MILOT. Montréal: Editions Beauchemin. 1960. Pp. 284. \$3.00. To be reviewed later.
- HAMELIN, JEAN, LETARTE, JACQUES, et HAMELIN, MARCEL. *Les élections provinciales dans le Québec*. Cahiers de Géographie de Québec, 7. Québec: Les Presses Universitaires Laval. 1960. Pp. 209. To be reviewed later.
- LAPORTE, PIERRE. *The True Face of Duplessis*. Montreal: Harvest House Limited. 1960. Pp. 141. \$1.50.
- Québec. *Annuaire statistique; Statistical Year Book, 1959*. Québec: Imprimeur de Sa Majesté la Reine. 1960. Pp. xx, 646.
- TOUGAS, GÉRARD. *Histoire de la littérature canadienne-française*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. 1960. Pp. 287. 15NF.

(3) The Province of Ontario

- DICKSON, JAMES. *Camping in the Muskoka Region: A Story of Algonquin Park*. Second edition. Foreword by LESLIE M. FROST. Toronto: Ontario Department of Lands and Forests, 1959. Pp. vi, 164.

- FOWLER, DANIEL. The Artist Turns Farmer: Chapters from the Autobiography of Daniel Fowler. Introduction by THOMAS R. LEE (*Ontario History*, LII (2), June, 1960, 98-110).
- GARBUTT, MARY E. King Township, York County, 1800-1867: A Historical Sketch (*Ontario History*, LII (2), June, 1960, 84-97).
- GROBICKI, ALEKSANDER. Paderewski's Concerts in Toronto (1892-1905) (*Polish Past in Canada*, 3, 1960, 71-88).
- LONDON, FRED. A Pioneer Abolitionist in Upper Canada (*Ontario History*, LII (2), June, 1960, 77-83). The author describes the trip of American abolitionist, Benjamin Lundy, to Canada in 1832.
- MATHEWS, HAZEL C., ed. Trafalgar Township in 1817 (*Ontario History*, LII (2), 1960, 111-16).
- MUSHAM, H. A. Early Great Lakes Steamboats, Hard Times and the Erie Disaster, 1840-1841 (*American Neptune*, XX (2), April, 1960, 79-103).

(4) The Prairie Provinces

- BUCK, RUTH MATHESON. The Mathesons of Saskatchewan (*Saskatchewan History*, XIII (2), spring, 1960, 41-62).
- HUBICZ, E. M. Early Polish Priests in Manitoba (*Polish Past in Canada*, 3, 1960, 89-100).
- JOHNSON, GILBERT. Swabian Folkways (*Saskatchewan History*, XIII (2), spring, 1960, 73-5).
- LIDDELL, KEN. *Alberta Revisited*. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1960. Pp. xiv, 234, illus. \$4.00.
- The Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association: Hillview Branch Minutes, 1910-1912 (*Saskatchewan History*, XIII (2), spring, 1960, 63-72).
- SMILEY, DONALD V. Local Autonomy and Central Administrative Control in Saskatchewan (*C.J.E.P.S.*, XXVI (2), May, 1960, 299-313).

(5) The Province of British Columbia

- FERGUSON, GEORGE V. Queen of the Kootenays (*Beaver*, outfit 290, spring, 1960, 18-23). The author recalls his visit to Nelson, B.C. fifty years ago.
- HAMILTON, J. H. The "All-Red Route," 1893-1953: A History of the Trans-Pacific Mail Service Between British Columbia, Australia, and New Zealand (*British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, XX (1 and 2), Jan.-April, 1956, 1-126).
- PATTERSON, R. M. Trail to the Big Bend (*Beaver*, outfit 290, spring, 1960, 38-43). The author writes about the trail to the Columbia goldfields in 1865.
- SUTTLES, WAYNE. Affinal Ties, Subsistence, and Prestige among the Coast Salish (*American Anthropologist*, LXII (2), April, 1960, 296-305).

IV. EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

- FERGUSON, C. BRUCE, comp. Mechanics' Institutes in Nova Scotia (*Bulletin of the Public Archives of Nova Scotia*, 14, 1960. Pp. 47).
- HARRIS, ROBIN S., and TREMBLAY, ARTHUR. *A Bibliography of Higher Education in Canada; Bibliographie de l'enseignement supérieur au Canada*. Studies in Higher Education in Canada, 1. Toronto and Québec: University of Toronto Press and Les Presses Universitaires Laval. 1960. Pp. xxvi, 158. \$6.50.
- MACKINNON, FRANK. *The Politics of Education: A Study of the Political Administration of the Public Schools*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1960. Pp. x, 187. \$4.75.
- MITCHENER, RALPH D. The Development of the National Conference of Canadian Universities, 1911 to 1959 (*Culture*, XXI (1), mars 1960, 46-77).

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Canada. Public Archives, Manuscript Division. *Preliminary Inventory, Manuscript Group 27: Political Figures, 1867-1948*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer. 1960. Pp. 64. \$5.00.

- Canada, Public Archives, Manuscript Division. *Preliminary Inventory, Record Group 2: Privy Council Office; Record Group 3: Post Office Department*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer. 1960. Pp. 22. \$.50.
- CHOJNACKI, WLADYSLAW. Canadian Items in Polish Periodical Literature: A Bibliography for the Period 1845-1958. (*Polish Past in Canada*, 3, 1960, 17-56).
- HERBERT, WALTER, and DILL, CHARLOTTE E. Periodical Literature in Canada (*Canadian Library*, XVI (6), May, 1960, 289-93).
- SMITH, ELSPETH, comp. *Recording Toronto: A Catalogue of selected pictures of early buildings and street scenes in the Town of York and the City of Toronto from the John Ross Robertson Historical Collection and other Picture Collections of the Toronto Public Libraries*. Introduction by H. C. CAMPBELL. Toronto: Toronto Public Libraries. 1960. Pp. 36. \$.35.
- TUREK, VICTOR. Canadian Polish Imprints, 1848-1957: Additional Entries (*Polish Past in Canada*, 3, 1960, 123-32).

VIII. ARTS AND SCIENCES

(2) Science, Industry, and Agriculture

- GREENING, W. E. The Economic Future of the Canadian Far North (*Contemporary Review*, CXCVII (1131), June, 1960, 193-7).
- ILLINGWORTH, FRANK. Aviation, the Key to Canada's Arctic (*Contemporary Review*, CXCVII (1128), March, 1960, 18-22).
- LIVINGSTON, K. C., and GRAHAM, T. C., eds. *Manufacturing Processes in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1960. Pp. viii, 304. \$10.50.
- MORSE, NORMAN H. Agriculture in the Maritime Provinces (*Dalhousie Review*, XXXIX (4), winter, 1960, 471-84).

Books Received

- BAIN, LESLIE B. *The Reluctant Satellites: An Eyewitness Report on East Europe and the Hungarian Revolution*. New York: The Macmillan Company [Galt: Brett-Macmillan Ltd.]. 1960. Pp. xii, 233. \$3.95.
- BILLIAS, GEORGE ATHAN. *General John Glover and His Marblehead Mariners*. New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1960. Pp. xii, 243, illus. \$5.50.
- BIRKS, MICHAEL. *Gentlemen of the Law*. London: Stevens & Sons Limited [Toronto: The Carswell Company Limited]. 1960. Pp. xii, 304. \$4.75.
- BLOND, GEORGES. *Admiral Togo*. Translated by EDWARD HYAMS. New York: The Macmillan Company [Galt: Brett-Macmillan Limited]. 1960. Pp. iv, 252. \$4.50.
- BRIGGS, LLOYD CABOT. *Tribes of the Sahara*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1960. Pp. xxii, 295, illus. \$7.95.
- CAMERON, MERIDITH E., MAHONEY, THOMAS H. D., and McREYNOLDS, GERORE E. *China, Japan and the Powers*. Second edition. Foreword by KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE. New York: The Ronald Press Company. 1960. Pp. xiv, 714. \$8.00.
- CRAIG, HARDIN. *Woodrow Wilson at Princeton*. Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press [Toronto: Burns & MacEachern Ltd.]. 1960. Pp. xii, 176, illus. \$4.75.
- CRANE, KATHARINE. *Mr. Carr of State: Forty-Seven Years in the Department of State*. New York: St. Martin's Press [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1960. Pp. xvi, 365, illus. \$6.75.
- DAVIES, JULES. *America and the World of Our Times: United States Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Random House, Inc. [Toronto: Random House of Canada Limited]. 1960. Pp. x, 597. \$5.60 text, \$7.50 trade.
- DEUTSCHER, ISAAC. *The Great Contest: Russia and the West*. New York and London: Oxford University Press [Toronto: Oxford University Press]. 1960. Pp. x, 86. \$2.75.
- DRAKE, PETER. *Amiable Renegade: The Memoirs of Captain Peter Drake, 1671-1753*. With a foreword by PAUL JORDAN-SMITH and an introduction notes by SIDNEY BURRELL. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1960. Pp. xlv, 410. \$7.50.
- FERGUSON, ARTHUR B. *The Indian Summer of English Chivalry: Studies in the Decline and Transformation of Chivalric Idealism*. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press. 1960. Pp. xviii, 242. \$6.00.
- FRANKFURTER, FELIX. *Felix Frankfurter Reminiscences*. As recorded in talks with HARLAN B. PHILLIPS. New York: Reynal & Company, Inc. [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1960. p. x, 310. \$5.75.
- FREIDEL, FRANK. *America in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1960. Pp. xxii, 593, xxiii, maps, charts, illus. \$6.75.
- HEWITT, A. R., comp. *Union List of Commonwealth Newspapers in London, Oxford and Cambridge*. London: The Athlone Press, University of London for the Institute of Commonwealth Studies [Toronto: University of Toronto Press]. 1960. Pp. x, 101. \$3.00.

- HILTON, GEORGE W., and DUE, JOHN F. *The Electric Interurban Railways in America*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press. 1960. Pp. xii, 463, illus. \$9.50.
- JACOBSON, HAROLD KARAN, ed. *America's Foreign Policy*. New York: Random House, Inc. [Toronto: Random House of Canada Limited]. 1960. Pp. xii, 756. \$6.50 text.
- LEVY, LEONARD W. *Legacy of Suppression: Freedom of Speech in Early American History*. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1960. Pp. xviii, 353. \$7.75.
- MARSHALL, A. H. *Financial Administration in Local Government*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd. for the Royal Institute of Public Administration [Toronto: Thomas Nelson & Sons (Canada) Limited]. 1960. Pp. 392. \$7.00.
- MILL, ANNA JEAN. ed. *John Mill's Boyhood Visit to France: A Journal and Notebook*. Toronto: University of Toronto. 1960. Pp. xxxii, 133. \$5.00.
- OGG, DAVID. *Europe in the Seventeenth Century*. Eighth edition. London: Adam & Charles Black [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1960. Pp. viii, 571. \$4.75.
- SINGLETERY, OTIS A. *The Mexican War*. The Chicago History of American Civilization edited by DANIEL J. BOORSTIN. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [Toronto: University of Toronto Press]. 1960. Pp. x, 181. \$3.75.
- SITHOLE, NDABANINGI. *African Nationalism*. Foreword by R. S. GARFIELD TODD. Cape Town and Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1959. Pp. x, 174. \$3.00.
- TALBOT, C. H., ed., and trans. *The Life of Christina of Markyate: A Twelfth Century Recluse*. London and Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1959. Pp. x, 193. \$5.25.
- TALPALAR, MORRIS. *The Sociology of Colonial Virginia*. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc. 1960. Pp. xii, 371. \$6.00.

Notes and Comments

HISTORIANS IN CANADA

AT THE University of British Columbia Professor Ping-ti Ho, recently promoted to the rank of Professor, was one of the Canadian delegates to the XXVth Congress of Orientalists held in Moscow in August, 1960. Professor Margaret Ormsby, whose recent volume *British Columbia: A History* won an award of merit from the American Association for State and Local History, has been appointed a member of the National Historic Sites and Monuments Board, representing British Columbia and the Yukon. Professor A. C. Cooke has retired as Professor of History, but will remain as a Special Lecturer. Professor T. J. Hanrahan has been granted leave of absence to continue research in mediaeval history, and Professor G. O. B. Davies has returned from a year of travel and research in Commonwealth countries.

The History Department at the University of Alberta has announced the appointment of Mr. A. L. Murray, Dr. J. J. Malone of the American University of Beirut, and Dr. Lewis Hertzman, formerly of Princeton. Dr. R. W. Beachey has returned to Makerere College, Kampala, Uganda, after spending a year as Associate Professor at Alberta. Dr. Peter Brock has been given a year's leave of absence to teach at Smith College. Professor W. J. Eccles's *Frontenac, The Courtier Governor* won the 1959 book award of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association. Professor F. D. Blackley has been appointed Assistant Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science.

Dr. Homer V. Rutherford, formerly Faculty Fellow of the Fund for the Advancement of Education and head of the Department at United College, was promoted to the rank of full Professor in September, 1960. Cornelius J. Jaenen was appointed Lecturer in History at United in September, 1959. Dr. Richard H. Frost was appointed Assistant Professor in September, 1960.

Professor E. T. Salmon of McMaster University has been appointed to the executive committee of the International Federation of Classical Associations. Professor D. M. L. Farr of Carleton will be a Visiting Professor at Duke University for the fall term and J. H. Stewart Reid and Harry S. Crowe have been appointed visiting lecturers during Professor Farr's absence. At the Université de Montréal Michel Brunet has been appointed "professeur titulaire et directeur de l'Institut d'histoire" and M. Maurice Séguin, professeur titulaire at the Institute. M. Jean Blain, formerly of Collège Jean-de-Brébeuf, has been appointed assistant professor at the Institute.

The University of Ottawa has announced the establishment of an Institute of Canadian History which, for the first time, will make available a B.A. honours programme in history. The Institute is headed by Dr. Guy Frégault, Freiman Professor of Canadian history and chairman of the Department of History. New additions to the staff are Dr. Alfred R. Vanasse, of St. Francis College, Biddeford, Maine; Miss Anna Maria Cienciala of McGill; and Mr. Richard A. Lebrun from

the University of Minnesota. Dr. Lucien Brault, Rev. Edgar Thivierge, and Rev. Gaston Carrière are to be associated with the Institute on a part-time basis.

Dr. I. N. Lambi has left the University of Toronto to become Assistant Professor of History at the University of Nebraska. Professors Zaslow and Spencer will spend the year in Europe on research leave. Professors A. P. Thornton of the University College of the West Indies has joined the Department. Other new appointments are R. C. Dalton, J. A. Betley and W. Goffart. Professors Craig and Nelson have returned after a years' absence in Europe and Washington respectively. Professor D. G. Creighton, formerly chairman of the Department, left Canada during the winter to serve on the Moncton Commission in Africa. He will spend part of the fall term as a visiting speaker at a number of United Kingdom universities.

IRISH STUDIES

AN AMERICAN COMMITTEE on Irish Studies has been formed to establish communication among those interested in Irish history and literature. The following officers have been selected: President, Gilbert Cahill, State University of New York (Cortland); Vice-President, Thomas N. Brown, Portsmouth Priory; Treasurer, Emmet Larkin, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Secretary, Lawrence J. McCaffrey, University of Illinois. At present the Committee is co-operating with the National Library of Ireland in a project to microfilm the materials on Britain and Ireland in the Propaganda archives in Rome. The American Council of Learned Societies and the Newberry Library, Chicago, are helping to finance the project and a copy of the film will be deposited at the Newberry Library. All those interested in joining the Committee are requested to contact Lawrence J. McCaffrey, Assistant Professor of History, Division of General Studies, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

DICTIONARY OF CANADIAN BIOGRAPHY

THE *Canadian Historical Review* of December, 1959, contained a statement with regard to the recent founding of the Dictionary of Canadian Biography, and an explanation of some of the general plans and procedures which were being initiated. An offprint of these notes was distributed in January, 1960, to some 2500 persons and institutions who had sent in requests for further information following the announcement of the establishment of the Dictionary.

The present notes are intended to give further information, and in particular to outline the progress which has been made in intervening months.

One of the principal aims of the Dictionary during its first year has been to establish contacts with persons and institutions whose assistance and advice can be of particular value. The distribution of the Bulletin was important in this respect, and resulted in a large number of inquiries and suggestions including names of subjects for consideration and also of possible contributors. Many of these communications came from outside Canada.

Efforts have also been made to establish personal contacts throughout Canada. With this in view, the General Editor has attended and spoken to the annual meetings of the Library Associations of the three Prairie Provinces, and also a special meeting of librarians in Vancouver; he has also visited centres in Ontario and Quebec and spoken to a number of meetings including the annual meetings of the Canadian Historical and Canadian Library Associations. Other trips, including one to the Maritime Provinces, are in contemplation.

The contacts made on these trips have been very useful already and will have a permanent value. In British Columbia, on the initiative of the Provincial Library Association, a DCB committee has been established under the chairmanship of Miss Eleanor Mercer of the library staff of the University of British Columbia. The intention is to create a British Columbia Biographical Name File which will be valuable for reference purposes in British Columbia, but from which the DCB can also draw material. Similar steps are also in contemplation elsewhere, the initiative being left in each case to those familiar with the local situation. In this way, it is hoped that not only will the DCB receive essential help from all parts of the country, but also that stimulus will be given to the study of regional and local history.

The Dictionary is especially gratified to be able to announce the establishment of a French-Canadian Consultation Committee, since it has been the intention from the beginning to aim at the publication of both a French and an English edition. A work on this scale in the two languages has not previously been attempted in Canada, and the many problems, both scholarly and financial, which are involved in such a collaboration will require continuous consultation. The Dictionary is most fortunate to have obtained the consent of a very strong panel of eminent scholars to serve on the committee. The chairman, Dean Pierre Dansereau of the University of Montreal, is a scientist of international reputation, widely known in academic and literary circles. His presence on the committee emphasizes the fact that the significance of the Dictionary is by no means confined strictly to the interests of the historian, important as those are. With Dean Dansereau are associated three outstanding French-Canadian historians: Professor M. Brunet of the University of Montreal; Professor Guy Frégault of the University of Ottawa; and Professor M. Trudel of Laval University. They are the heads of the Departments or Institutes of History in their respective universities, and the Dictionary has therefore not only the benefit of their personal interest, but also the advantage of close contact with important centres of research in Canadian history.

The Dictionary wishes to record here its deep appreciation of the reception already given to it in French Canada. This has been shown in a variety of ways—by individual letters offering suggestions and assistance, by notices in the press, and by the welcome received on personal visits. A great deal of intensive work has been, and is being, done on the history of French Canada, and the Dictionary hopes to take full advantage of the results of this French-Canadian scholarship.

Something should now be said with regard to the procedures so far put into effect, and the progress of the work to date.

The creation of a Name File covering the whole of Canadian History was begun in 1959 when the DCB was established. In its early stages, it was compiled from selected reference works, and by the end of 1959 contained some 6000 cards. The building up of this general File has been continued in two ways: through the work of the DCB staff, and through information received from individuals and institutions. Some of this information, all of which has been welcome, has come unsolicited; some of it has come in response to Name Lists or inquiries sent out from the DCB office. The distribution of Name Lists of various kinds will be continued since this appears to be the best way of encouraging suggestions from outside sources.

While additions to all parts of the Name File will continue to be made, it is intended to work intensively on selected periods. The first period on which intensive work was begun is the early part of Canadian history. As a result it is planned to issue in printed form in the autumn a "Preliminary List of Names under Consideration for Volume I," the tentative terminal date of which is 1700. (It should be noted that the inclusion of a name in a volume is determined by the death date, or by the latest date of known activity, if death date is unknown). This Preliminary List, and others of the same kind when prepared, will be sent to individuals and institutions whose expert advice will assist in screening out or adding names so that the list may be brought to a final form. It is thus hoped that the selection of names for inclusion in Volume I will be as representative and authoritative as possible. Recipients of the lists are also being asked to suggest names of possible contributors, to comment on the lengths of biographies, and to give information with regard to materials which might be overlooked.

Requests to possible contributors to write biographies will follow as quickly as possible on the circulation of the Name Lists. The categories of length and scale of payments for articles are as follows: Category I, 8,000–10,000 words, \$200; II, 5,000–7,000, \$150; III, 3,000–4,000, \$100; IV, 1,500–2,500, \$50; V, 700–1,000, \$30; VI, 300–500, \$25; VII, factual notes of less than 200 words, most of which will be prepared by the DCB staff. The rates of payment have been made as generous as possible for the shorter biographies since it is recognized that they will often require a proportionately greater time in preparation. The payments to contributors are estimated to exceed \$17,000 per volume.

A careful effort has been made in compiling a list of possible contributors for Volume I, and also in preparing the mailing list of persons and institutions to whom the preliminary Name List for Volume I will be sent. The DCB will be pleased to receive any additional names to be added to these lists. A memorandum of Directives to Contributors is also available on request.

The second period chosen for intensive study is the latter half of the nineteenth century, 1851–1900. Work has been carried on for these years during the past summer, and will be continued with the intention of producing a Preliminary List of Names for a volume in that period as soon as possible. The expectation is that there will eventually be several volumes for the years, 1851–1900, possibly one for each decade. One advantage of preparing a volume in this period is that it will

draw in a different group of contributors from those primarily interested in Volume I.

Plans are made to begin in the immediate future the preparation of a Preliminary Name List for a volume to begin in 1701 and extend to some point in the eighteenth century.

The Dictionary is pleased to announce the appointment of Miss Elizabeth W. Loosley as Assistant to the General Editor. Miss Loosley brings to her new position a wide experience in writing, research, and library work which will be a valuable asset. Mrs. H. L. McDougall has also recently been appointed as Secretary. The Dictionary has been very fortunate in obtaining expert part-time assistance which has been most important in the preparation of the Name Lists. Mr. M. Grenon and Father J. Monet, who are graduates of the University of Montreal, have worked on the Volume I list; Mr. W. G. Saywell, a graduate of the University of Toronto, has been working on the Name File for the second half of the nineteenth century. During the summer Father Monet has visited individuals, libraries, and archives in Ottawa, Montreal, and Quebec. Other part-time assistants have been Mr. J. Buell and Miss Barbara Fraser. It is the intention to employ expert part-time help not only in Toronto but elsewhere as the need arises.

Though still in its formative stages, the DCB is already greatly indebted to many persons and institutions, who have sent in cards, examined lists of names, and otherwise helped in a variety of ways. As the scope of the work widens, a great many others will be drawn in, not only in Canada but in many other countries. The Dictionary is particularly interested, for example, in obtaining the names of Canadians who have gained distinction abroad and therefore should be included in the printed volumes. Some such names have already been sent in, and a systematic effort will be made to obtain more. This is a difficult category, however, and suggestions with regard to it will be gratefully received. For these and other favours, past and future, the DCB wishes to express its sincere thanks.

GEORGE W. BROWN,
General Editor.

CONTRIBUTORS

J. M. BECK is an Associate Professor of Political and Economic Science at Royal Military College, Kingston and the author of the *Government of Nova Scotia* (1957).

H. R. BALLS is Comptroller of the Treasury, Department of Finance, Ottawa.

DUANE C. TWAY, a Major in the United States Air Force, is an Assistant Professor of History at the Air Force Academy, Colorado.

JOHN CONWAY is Master of Leverett House at Harvard University.

RICHARD A. PRESTON, Professor of History at Royal Military College, is author of a recent volume of the Champlain Society, *Kingston Before the War of 1812*.

DRS

Mili-

ssor

of a